THE HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA

ITS AUTHORSHIP AND AUTHORITY

BY

E. M. WALKER

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1913

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK
TORONTO MELBOURNE BOMBAY
HUMPHREY MILFORD M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY

BERNARDO P. GRENFELL

ARTVRO S. HUNT

OLIM DISCIPVLIS IAM PRIDEM COLLEGIS

REGINENSIS REGINENSIBVS

D. D.

HVNC LIBELLVM

SCRIPTOR

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 7

LECTURE I

THE LITERATURE OF THE CONTROVERSY . . . 15

LECTURE II

THE CURRENT ASSUMPTIONS 27

LECTURE III

THE CASE FOR EPHORUS 49

LECTURE IV

THE CASE AGAINST EPHORUS EXAMINED . . . 79

LECTURE V

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NARRATIVE 111

LECTURE VI

THE BOEOTIAN LEAGUE 134

INTRODUCTION

THE lectures which are contained in this volume were delivered in Michaelmas Term, 1912, at the invitation of the Delegates of the Common University Fund, to whom I am indebted for an opportunity of giving expression to my views regarding the authorship and historical value of the famous fragment, which has come to be known (most unfortunately, in my judgement) as the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. But for the invitation which they extended to me the lectures would not have been given, nor the book written.

I wish to make it plain, in the first place, that the lectures are what they profess to be—lectures. They were delivered before they were written, and they were delivered *ex tempore*, in the sense in which sermons are said to be preached *ex tempore*; that is, they were delivered without the aid of manuscript or notes. Four out of the six were taken down by reporters, and they are printed from the shorthand writers' notes. A few changes have been made: occasional repetitions have been struck out, clauses have been sometimes transposed, a sentence here and there has been touched up, once or twice an argument which upon reflection ceased to satisfy me has been omitted, and some additional references have been inserted; but if any of those who attended the course should do me the honour to read the lectures in print, they are

not likely to detect the alterations. The fifth lecture was written out from memory. The last lecture did not form part of the course. It was prepared, but the time at my disposal did not allow of its delivery. It has been delivered often enough, I fear, to my college pupils across my table.

It is as lectures that I ask that they should be judged. There is a substantial difference between a lecture in the proper sense and a lecture in the conventional sense; by which I mean a chapter of a book which is read aloud to a class. In the one case, the lecture exists before the book; in the other, the book exists before the lecture. This is not the occasion on which to argue which is the better as a lecture; all that I am concerned to point out is that they are different. The lecture proper owes its form to the class, just as the lecture by convention owes its form to the study and the desk. The class reacts upon the lecturer: he is conscious of the presence of his audience, and quick to mark the argument that misses fire; the 'we' and the 'you' have a better right for their appearance than that of a mere literary tradition; even the 'I' will be unduly prominent. If in the present lectures the first person obtrudes itself more often than I could wish, I trust that it may be read as a note of intimacy, rather than of dogmatism.

They are intended, too, as lectures upon certain clearly defined problems, not as a commentary upon the whole contents of the fragment. A good deal might be said on many subjects which I have left untouched; on Demaenetus, or Theban politics, or the naval operations, or the ἔτος ὄγδοον. The omissions

are designed: I have said nothing, either because a discussion of these questions seem to me irrelevant to the main issues, or else because I had nothing of my own to say. Where I had nothing new to contribute in the way of suggestion, argument, or criticism, I preferred to say nothing. It is for the same reason that I have contented myself with the briefest summary of the arguments which were advanced in my article in *Klio*. One of the strongest arguments for Ephorus is to be found in the disproof of the case for Theopompus; this is a task which has been attempted in *Klio*, to which I must refer my readers.

Nor have I discussed, explicitly at least, the claims of Cratippus. It is not because I have been convinced either that he is a phantom or a writer of the Alexandrine epoch that I have deserted his cause. I am still prepared to assert for Cratippus all that I asserted five years ago: a flesh-and-blood existence, a *floruit* midway between Thucydides and Xenophon, Athenian citizenship, and a range of subject from Cyzicus to Cnidus; ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ὁ αὐτός εἰμι τῇ γνώμῃ. And I still infer from the fragment all, or almost all, the characteristics which I claimed for P. If I no longer claim that he is an Athenian (and I claimed it very doubtfully), I claim that he is next door to an Athenian; that he was in closest touch with Athens. But on such fundamental questions as those of style, of date of composition, and of political sympathies, I have nothing to retract. I have thrown up my brief for Cratippus, not because I can no longer contend against the weight of hostile evidence, but, simply and solely, because I have ventured to examine the current assumptions which were held

to bar the claim of Ephorus. The case for Cratippus did not rest upon the positive evidence in his favour. The positive evidence for an author who is referred to less than half a dozen times in all, and whose fragments sum up to less than a dozen lines, must necessarily be slight. The argument by which I sought to establish his identity with P. was deductive, rather than inductive, and the case was, admittedly, strongest on its negative side. If P. could not be Theopompus, he must be Cratippus; he *must* be, for there is no third possibility. If once this premiss is denied; if once it can be established that neither the scale of P. nor his *οἰκονομία* constitutes an insuperable objection to his identification with Ephorus, the one strong argument for Cratippus—the disjunctive one—disappears. P. cannot be Theopompus, but he may be Ephorus or Cratippus. And for Ephorus the positive evidence is not slight, but ample. We know nothing about the style of Cratippus, or his political standpoint, or his sympathies and antipathies, or his intellectual level; though we know something of the scope of his work, we know almost nothing of its contents. We cannot, at any rate, test its coincidences with P. The opposite of all this holds good of Ephorus. His literary style and the temper of his mind, his political standpoint, his choice of subjects and the order of his narrative, even his actual phraseology, can all be verified. If any of my readers find that the arguments which I have adduced on all these various points are convincing, I am fairly certain that they will not turn back to reconsider the case for Cratippus.

In discussing the probable length of a book of

Ephorus, and of a line of Theopompus, I have not thought it necessary to refer to the results arrived at by Graux, in his paper on *Stichométrie* in the volume of the *Revue de Philologie* for 1878, because it appeared to me that his conclusions throw little light upon the problems with which I was concerned. The hypothesis of a standard *στίχος* of thirty-four to thirty-eight letters, or fifteen to sixteen syllables (the mean length of the hexameter line), has received no little confirmation since *Stichométrie* first appeared; but this confirmation has not come from the science of Papyrology, which was as yet unborn when the article was written. A *στίχος* of thirty-four to thirty-eight letters may have been something more than an ideal standard by which to compute the relative length of literary works, or the due remuneration of the scribe; the evidence suggests that it must sometimes have been an actual standard to which the copyist conformed. In our extant papyri, however, so far from being a normal length, it is an unusual one. This renders it certain that it was not a *κανών* to which the copyist was bound to conform, or which invariably regulated the length of his line. Hence, Graux's investigations do not serve to fix the mean length of the *ἔπη* of Theopompus; we are not compelled to assume for his *Hellenica* 150,000 lines of thirty-four or thirty-eight letters apiece. In the same way it is clear that Graux's average for the length of a roll, 2,000 *στίχοι*, does not determine the length of a book of Ephorus. His results, if valid at all, would be more likely to be valid for the century of Diodorus than for the century of Ephorus and Theopompus. Yet some books of Diodorus contained many more than

2,000 *στίχοι* apiece: they must have run to two rolls or more. Nor can we obtain a conclusive answer from Papyrology. It can fix the *maxima* for the length of a roll, for its height, for the number of lines in a column, and for the number of letters in a line. But if the ascertained length of a book of Diodorus, or of a book of Polybius, transcends the utmost capacity of a single roll, it is evident that we cannot argue from the roll to the book. There were books that occupied more than a single roll.[1]

Since the delivery of these lectures, two further contributions to the literature of the controversy have come to hand.

The first of these is the first half of a paper by Professor L. Pareti, of Florence, entitled *Cratippo e le 'Elleniche' di Oxyrhynchos*, which appeared in vol. xix of the *Studi italiani di Filologia Classica* (1912). He comes to the conclusion that Cratippus was an Athenian, who wrote in the first half of the fourth century; that P. wrote between 371 and 356, that he began in the Decelean War at least, and that his work was not a mere continuation of Thucydides. The starting-point of the *ἔτος ὄγδοον* he puts in the autumn of 403. He accepts the current assumptions as to the scale and method of Ephorus, and he subscribes to the objections which have been urged against Theopompus. Both the general results at which he arrives, and the arguments by which these results are reached, do not appear to differ materially from the results and the arguments of my article in *Klio*.

[1] I have no claim of any kind to speak with authority on such questions. I have, however, had the advantage of discussing these points with Professor Hunt.

The other contribution is of a much slighter character in point of length; it amounts to less than a page of the *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* (1912, No. 51). The aim of the writer, P. Maas, is to establish the identity of the style of the *Hellenica* of Theopompus with that of his *Philippica*. His argument is based upon those fragments of the *Hellenica* (21 (*a*), 14, and 22, G. and H.) which alone afford a test of style. In all of these he claims that the closest similarity with the style of the *Philippica* is to be traced. 21 (*a*) furnishes much the best evidence in support of his contention. Quite apart from the general impression left by the fragment, the use of *φανήσεται*, to which Maas calls attention, is strongly in his favour. It is an unmistakable note of the artificial rhetoric of the age; we meet it frequently elsewhere (e. g. in one of the most famous passages in the *Panegyricus*), and it occurs no less than three times in the fragments of the *Philippica* (119, 121, 244). The importance of Maas's contribution is not to be measured by its length. He has shown that the evidence, so far as it extends, goes to prove that the style of the *Hellenica* was cast in the same rhetorical mould as that of the *Philippica*. The form of the non-Isocratean Theopompus of the *Hellenica*, not too substantial to start with, has become more phantom-like than ever.

It is significant that both the writers whose contributions have appeared since the delivery of the lectures are recruits to the cause of Cratippus. I had even better reason than I suspected for the assertion that the dissentients had not been silenced. If we are to go by counting heads, the cause of Theopompus is a lost one.

As these sheets were passing through the press, an

article by F. Rühl, entitled *Randglossen zu den Hellenika von Oxyrhynchos,* appeared in the *Rheinisches Museum.*[1] On the question of authorship, Rühl has a suggestion—Anaximenes—but no arguments. He is, however, to be counted among the opponents of Theopompus. The article is chiefly concerned with Agesilaus' first campaign in 395 and the battle of Sardis. Some of the criticisms of Xenophon's narrative are new, and deserving of consideration.

My sincere thanks are due to Miss Lorimer, of Somerville College, who most kindly undertook the task of reading through the proof-sheets.

[1] Bd. lxviii (1913).

LECTURE I

THE LITERATURE OF THE CONTROVERSY

FIVE years have now elapsed since the publication, in the famous fifth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, of the fragments of a new Greek historian. And just four years have elapsed since any contribution to the discussion of the subject has appeared in English, so far as I am aware. Yet during these four years—we may take the meeting of the International Congress for Historical Studies, which was held at Berlin in August, 1908, as a definite point from which to reckon—much has been written upon the Continent, and a good deal of that which has appeared is of much importance. I venture therefore to think that I should have been justified in accepting the invitation of the Delegates of the Common University Fund to deliver these lectures, even if I had set before myself no more ambitious task than that of stock-taking; even if I had nothing new to contribute in the way of hypothesis or argument, and if all that I had set before myself was the work of description, criticism, and comparison. It appears to me, however, that the appearance, a year ago, of Judeich's article[1] in the *Rheinisches Museum*, constitutes a new phase of the controversy. I do not know how it may strike other people, but to me, at any rate, it seems clear that in the immediate future the controversy must proceed upon the lines that he has indicated, no matter whether we agree or disagree with his conclusions.

[1] W. Judeich, '*Theopomps Hellenika*,' *Rheinisches Museum*, lxvi (1911), pp. 94 ff.

The plan which I propose to follow—and I think it will prove to be the most convenient plan—is to start by giving a brief account of the principal contributions to the discussion of this subject which have appeared since the epoch which I have taken as my starting-point—the meeting of the Congress at Berlin.

First in order of importance, though not in order of time, comes Meyer's book,[1] which appeared the year after the Congress. The first in point of date, however, was an article by Mr. Underhill,[2] in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, which appeared in October, 1908, a few months after the Congress. Next, in the *Rheinisches Museum* of 1909 there appeared an article by a writer, who, I fancy, is a comparatively young student, A. von Mess, of Bonn, which deals with the relations between the New Historian and certain passages in Xenophon and Diodorus. In 1910 Busolt published an article in *Hermes*, entitled *Zur Glaubwürdigkeit Theopomps.*[3] Lastly, in 1911 there appeared two further contributions to the literature of the subject. The first of these is an article by Judeich (so well known to us by his work on Asia Minor), called, somewhat misleadingly, *Theopomps Hellenika*, to which I have already referred; the second is to be found in the section on Greek History in the third

[1] E. Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenika*, 1909.

[2] G. E. Underhill, '*Theopompus* (*or Cratippus*), *Hellenica*,' *J. H. S.* xxviii (1908), 277 ff.

[3] W. A. Bauer, *Die spartanischen Nauarchen der Jahre* 397/95 (*Wiener Studien*, xxxii. 1910), does not discuss the question of authorship, but the article has some bearing on the question of authority. The same remark applies to Glotz's monograph on the Boeotian Councils. Among articles dealing with minor points, some of which have a bearing upon the question of authorship and authority, I may mention U. Wilcken, *Ein Theopompfragment in den neuen Hellenika*, *Hermes*, xliii (1908), p. 475; E. Jacoby, *Klio*, ix (1909), p. 97; C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Klio*, viii (1908), p. 265.

volume of Gercke und Norden's *Einleitung*,[1] which is from the pen of Professor Lehmann-Haupt, whom, I am glad to say, England has annexed from Germany, and Liverpool from Berlin, since the meeting of the Congress. There remain to be mentioned three articles of considerable importance, which have an indirect bearing upon the subject. All these three articles are concerned with Ephorus, and all three appeared in *Hermes*. In the volume for 1909 there appeared two articles, the one being in answer to the other. The first article, *Wann hat Ephoros sein Geschichtswerk geschrieben?* was by B. Niese; the answer to this, *Die Zeit des Ephoros*, was by E. Schwartz. In the volume of *Hermes* for 1911 there appeared an article in two parts by a student of a younger generation, R. Laqueur, of Strassburg—a writer whose articles are distinguished rather by their minute learning than by the lucidity of their style.

Meyer's book, *Theopomps Hellenika*, is not entirely, nor even mainly, concerned with the question of authorship. Out of one hundred and fifty pages, some thirty are occupied with the question of authorship, one hundred with the discussion of the subject-matter, and twenty with further subsidiary questions. It would be impertinent in me to dwell upon the great importance of this work, and of its contribution towards the study of the subject; but I venture to think that its importance lies rather in the hundred pages which are devoted to a discussion of the subject-matter than in the thirty pages which deal with the question of authorship. It does not appear to me that anything has been contributed in these pages that is at once fresh and material. I fail to see that the

[1] Gercke u. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Bd. iii, p. 89.

case for Theopompus is in any degree a stronger case than it was as presented by the original editors of the fragment in the fifth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Those who were already convinced will remain convinced; but those who were unconvinced have not had their doubts removed. We are still confronted with the same old difficulties—the difficulties as to style, as to date, as to political opinions, and as to the relations of P. to Ephorus,[1] and of Theopompus to Xenophon. In explanation of the difficulty as to style, we are presented with an hypothesis which becomes, I think (and I am certainly not speaking for myself only), less attractive the more we study it—the hypothesis of the two Theopompuses: the youthful Theopompus, the author of the *Hellenica*, and the mature Theopompus, the author of the *Philippica*; the young Theopompus dominated by the influence of Thucydides, and the mature Theopompus dominated by the influence of Isocrates. The hypothesis of a Thucydidean Theopompus as the author of the *Hellenica* does not become more plausible when it turns out that there is nothing Thucydidean about the Thucydidean Theopompus, save the chronological scheme of the narrative. Except in 'the summers and winters of the war', there is not a trace of the influence of Thucydides to be found. Further, this hypothetical Theopompus is marked by those qualities or characteristics which we associate with age rather than with youth; he is scientific, he is cautious, he is dull. Yet the young Theopompus, not of hypothesis but of history, was at the age of twenty-four—at an age when, on Meyer's hypothesis, he had not yet written the *Hellenica*—a past-master in

[1] In accordance with a usage which the Editors have rendered classical, P. is employed throughout these lectures to denote the author of the fragment.

the art of rhetoric. I need not, perhaps, insist any further on the argument from style, for it has been urged again and again since the first publication of the fragment; nor on another difficulty, the difficulty of date: the impossibility, on the one hand, of supposing that Theopompus wrote the *Hellenica* at the age of twenty-two, and, on the other hand, if you assume a later date for its composition, the conflict which then results between the internal evidence of the papyrus and your hypothesis. I will content myself with saying that the arguments which I ventured to put forward in my article in *Klio*,[1] in favour of a date earlier than 356 B.C., have been reinforced by another argument derived from the policy of the Persian kings.[2] There still remains, too, the difficulty of having to assume that Ephorus wrote his History some considerable time after Theopompus wrote his *Hellenica*. There still remains the difficulty which is involved in Porphyry's charge of plagiarism;[3] for few will find it probable, either that Porphyry was generalizing for a single instance (πολλὰ τοῦ Ξενοφῶντος αὐτὸν μετατιθέντα κατείληφα), or that Theopompus, while intentionally diverging from Xenophon everywhere else, should have felt himself compelled to follow him in the one instance of the interview between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus. Lastly, of course, we are still confronted with the difficulty arising out of the writer's political views and sympathies. Theopompus, we know, was anti-Athenian in his sympathies, aristocratic in his bias, and an enthusiastic admirer of Agesilaus: it passes the wit of man to discover any

[1] '*Cratippus or Theopompus?*' *Klio*, Bd. viii (1908), pp. 356–71.

[2] See Judeich, *Rhein. Mus.*, 1911, p. 98.

[3] Porphyry *ap.* Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*, p. 465 b–c (=Theopomp. 23, G. and H.).

of those characteristics in P. So far as he has an enthusiasm for anybody, it is for Conon rather than Agesilaus. And therefore I venture to think that the argument in favour of Theopompus, so far as it is an inductive argument, remains where it was. The strength of the argument is, as it always was, deductive, not inductive. With regard to the question of authority, the attitude adopted by Meyer is one of compromise. He is convinced that Theopompus had before him, not only in our papyrus fragment, but in those passages of Diodorus which are assumed to have come ultimately from Theopompus, through the medium of Ephorus (e.g. the campaign of Thibron, and the Spartan invasion of Elis), excellent material, of which, however, he occasionally made far from an intelligent use. For the naval warfare, for instance, Meyer is prepared to accept the whole account. On the other hand, in regard to the campaign of Thibron, in 399, and the Spartan invasion of Elis, he thinks that Xenophon is right and Theopompus wrong. In the case of Thibron, his explanation is that Theopompus applied to the campaign of 399 the genuine incidents of Thibron's later campaign in 391, the campaign which centred round Magnesia. In the case of the invasion of Elis, the suggestion is that Theopompus substituted for the narrative of the main operations a perfectly correct account of subsidiary operations. That there were such subsidiary operations is, of course, pure assumption; there is not a scrap of proof that can be adduced. It will be observed that Meyer makes some very serious concessions to Busolt. He admits, in the first place, that Theopompus was acquainted with Xenophon's *Hellenics*, and that his object was to supersede the *Hellenics*—which is precisely Busolt's position. And two further points which he

concedes are very important points indeed. Both in the war with Elis, and in the campaign of Thibron, he admits that Theopompus is wrong and Xenophon right.

Mr. Underhill's article is concerned, firstly, with the question of authorship, and secondly, with the determination of two points of great importance. The first of these is the epoch from which the ἔτος ὄγδοον, near the beginning of column iii (ch. iv) of the papyrus, is reckoned; the second is the question of the scope of P.'s work. On the question of authorship, while Mr. Underhill is entirely against the claims of Theopompus, he refuses to accept those of Cratippus. Like Fuhr, who has contributed not a little to the textual criticism of the fragment, he falls back, if I may borrow a phrase from the original editors, upon an attitude of pure agnosticism. With regard to the starting-point of the ἔτος ὄγδοον, he maintains, against the Editors, that it was the year 402, and not the year 403; while with regard to the scope of the work, he maintains that it started from this year 402, and that it was not intended as a continuation of the work of Thucydides. As will appear subsequently, I disagree with many of his conclusions; but his article would be of great importance, if for no other reason than this. He was, so far as I am aware, the first writer who seriously called in question the assumption upon which all other theories have been based—that the starting-point of the work was the moment when Thucydides left off; i.e. that the work started at the end of 411, and that it was intended as a continuation of Thucydides. He also calls in question the assumed *terminus ad quem*, the battle of Cnidus (394 B.C.). Everybody else had assumed that the work began in 411 and ended in 394.

Von Mess's article is concerned with four subjects.[1] He deals with the campaign of Thibron in 399, the two campaigns of Agesilaus in 395, and the outbreak of the war between Phocis and Boeotia in 395. As to the first of these, the campaign of Thibron, he endeavours to explain the discrepancies between Diodorus' account, which is supposed to go back ultimately to P., and Xenophon's by the assumption that Diodorus is recounting operations conducted by Thibron before he had been reinforced by the Ten Thousand. With regard to the first campaign of Agesilaus and the outbreak of the war between the Phocians and Thebans, he decides altogether in favour of P., as against Xenophon. With regard to the second campaign of Agesilaus, the autumn campaign, he admits that there are inaccuracies in P., but he regards them as of minor importance. Of these four positions, the first, his theory of Thibron's campaign, has been conclusively disproved by Meyer, by the aid of a chronological argument, which is based on a comparison of the data afforded by the *Anabasis* with those supplied by the *Hellenics* of Xenophon. The other points raised in this article have been discussed more fully both by Meyer and by Judeich. The article, taken as a whole, may not unfairly be described as suggestive, but slight.

It will be remembered that in the early part of 1908, that is to say, before the meeting of the Congress, Busolt had published an article in *Hermes*, in which, while accepting the authorship of Theopompus, he seeks to explain the discrepancies between P. and Xenophon by the assumption that Theopompus' sole object was to supersede Xenophon's work. Theopompus, he contends, had Xenophon's *Hellenics* before him, but, unfortunately,

[1] In justice to him I should point out that his article was in print before the appearance of Meyer's *Hellenika*.

nothing more than the *Hellenics*, except on certain points, such as the naval operations; consequently, he proceeded by the simple method of writing 'Yes' where Xenophon wrote 'No', and 'No' where Xenophon wrote 'Yes'—a method which has enabled him occasionally to arrive at the truth without intending it. In his article *Zur Glaubwürdigkeit Theopomps* he returns to the charge. He deals with Meyer's attempt to rescue the reputation of Theopompus in regard to certain episodes, such as the invasion of Elis, the campaign of Thibron, and the battle of Sardis. His decision is given in favour of Xenophon on all three occasions. Theopompus' sole motive was vanity, and his sole source the inner consciousness. I am bound to say that, as against Meyer, the polemic is not ineffective.

Professor Lehmann-Haupt adds his contribution to the discussion of the subject in two different passages in the third volume of Gercke und Norden's *Einleitung*. In the first of these (p. 89) he deals with Cratippus, and discusses the question whether he is a phantom, or real flesh and blood. He decides in favour of flesh and blood. In the second passage (pp. 114–117) he treats of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and its authorship. The conclusion at which he arrives is that the work is that of Cratippus, who is an earlier writer than Theopompus, and an Athenian. He suggests, however, that Theopompus may have used Cratippus, and that in this way the coincidences between P. and Theopompus may be explained.

Lastly, we come to Judeich's article. He summarizes with some skill the objections that have been advanced against the authorship of Theopompus, but he contributes to the argument nothing that is really novel, except, perhaps, his point about the policy of the Persian kings,

in its bearing on the date. The importance of the article consists in this, that he has the courage to say quite boldly that P. is Ephorus. The great merit of the article is that the writer has indicated the weakness of the assumptions upon which the ordinary position rests; the defect of the article is that he is very far indeed from having established his own positions.

As to the other three articles on Ephorus, I shall not say much about them at this point, because I shall have a good deal to say about them later on. Niese's article is an attempt to establish the later of the two alternative dates which have been suggested for the composition of Ephorus' work. He seeks to prove that it was composed after the death of Alexander, i.e. after 323; whereas the other view (represented, e.g., by Schwartz) is that it was composed between the year 350 and the accession of Alexander, and nearer to 350 than 336. Niese's position is based upon two arguments. In the first place, he points to the occurrence in the fragments of Ephorus of references to events which are later than the accession or the death, as the case may be, of Alexander; secondly, he argues that Ephorus carried his work down to the siege of Perinthus in 341, in opposition to the view that he carried down his work only as far as the outbreak of the Sacred War in 356. Schwartz's article aims at a refutation of both Niese's arguments. The references to events later than the date of Alexander's accession or death are explained away on the hypothesis that they occurred in the thirtieth book, which was the work, not of Ephorus himself, but of his son Demophilus. Schwartz's fire, however, is concentrated upon Niese's main position, that Ephorus himself carried his work down to the year 341. I should have been disposed to say that Schwartz's

refutation of Niese's interpretation of the famous passage in Diodorus[1] was complete and final, had it not been that the next writer of whom I come to speak apparently finds Niese's arguments convincing. However, this is a subject on which I shall have much to say in a later lecture. Laqueur's article, it will be seen subsequently, is of great importance in connexion with this question. He seeks to prove that the prefaces which Diodorus composed for each of his books are derived from, or are excerpts from, the *προοίμια* of Ephorus. Ephorus was the first historian of antiquity of whom it can be said with certainty that he divided his work into books, the division into books of the works of earlier writers being commonly supposed to date from the Alexandrine period. Diodorus tells us, not only that Ephorus divided his History into books, but that he prefixed a *προοίμιον* to each book.[2] Laqueur maintains that we have the substance of certain of these *προοίμια* in the prefaces of Diodorus. It is evident that this contention, if it can be sustained, has an important bearing upon the question of the arrangement, the scope, and the method of Ephorus' work.

We are now in a position to sum up the views which have been expressed on the question of authorship, and to attempt to strike a balance. To do this, it is clear that we must go back to the first publication of the Papyrus. For Theopompus we have Meyer, Busolt, Wilamowitz, Schwartz, Wilcken, and Laqueur.[3] Perhaps we must add the Editors themselves. And that, of course, is an enormous weight of opinion. On the other hand, against Theopompus we have, among German

[1] XVI. 14. 3.

[2] Diodorus XVI. 76. 5.

[3] This is, I fancy, a certain inference from Laqueur's article.

scholars, Blass, Dittenberger, Jacoby, Fuhr, Judeich, W. A. Bauer, Lehmann-Haupt, and Beloch;[1] in Italy, de Sanctis;[2] and among writers in English practically everybody, except (a serious exception) the Editors; e.g. Mr. Underhill, Professor Bury, and Mr. Goligher. Of those who are against Theopompus, the majority are in favour of Cratippus. The only writer in favour of Ephorus is Judeich.[3] From this survey two conclusions emerge pretty clearly. The first is this; that in spite of this great weight of authority, in a country in which authority of that kind counts for much, the voice of the doubters is not hushed. And the doubt is most loudly expressed precisely among the younger scholars. If the case for Theopompus were overwhelming, you would expect that by this time everybody would be agreed, just as everybody is agreed as to the authorship of the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία.* Everybody is now agreed that Aristotle is its author; yet I can remember when there was a very strong opposition to this view, but that opposition has long been silenced.[4] And the second is this; that in the recent literature it has become more and more evident that the solution of the problem is to be found in the discussion of the claims of Ephorus. Consciously or unconsciously, writer after writer has been led to concentrate his attention upon this question, and in the most recent articles Ephorus bulks largely.

[1] P. Maas and F. Rühl may now be added to this list. Beloch merely states his conclusion that P. is Cratippus (Bd. i, p. 28 of the second edition, 1912): a discussion of the question is promised in the second volume when it appears.

[2] And Pareti.

[3] The idea that P. might be Ephorus had occurred to W. A. Bauer before the publication of Judeich's article. See *Die spartanischen Nauarchen der Jahre* 397/95.

[4] Perhaps I should have said 'been silent'. One or two scholars in our own country appear to be still unconvinced.

LECTURE II.

THE CURRENT ASSUMPTIONS

In the last lecture I expressed an opinion that the real argument in favour of Theopompus was not an inductive argument, but a deductive argument: a deductive argument which, like all deductive arguments, assumes certain premisses. The premisses are these: firstly, that the Papyrus is a fragment of a work on an elaborate scale that dealt with the period from 411 to 394; secondly, that the author must have been a writer of eminence, otherwise he would not have been copied in a country-town in Egypt, in the third century A. D.; and thirdly, that the *Hellenica* of Theopompus is the only work that satisfies both these conditions. Given these premisses, the conclusion is, of course, inevitable. The Papyrus *must* be a fragment of Theopompus' *Hellenica*. There is, I believe, a school of logicians which maintains that the apodeictic judgement possesses less force than the assertorial.

These assumptions, these premisses from which the argument starts, I now propose to examine.

The first assumption to be examined is that which relates to the scope of the work. Mr. Underhill has endeavoured to prove that the starting-point of the work was the year 402, from which the ἔτος ὄγδοον is reckoned. It had been argued by the Editors, against any such position, that the phrase which occurs twice over[1] in the Papyrus, ὥσπερ εἴρηκά που καὶ πρότερον, in

[1] Ch. ii, § 4; in a slightly varied form in ch. xii, § 1.

reference to events which fall within the last period of the Peloponnesian War, proves conclusively that the writer had dealt with the period between 411 and the end of the War in an earlier part of his work. Mr. Underhill thinks that it does not. In this I cannot agree with him. To my mind the Editors' argument is convincing. The occurrence of this phrase, however, does not involve the year 411 as the starting-point. It would be consistent with an earlier, indeed with a much earlier *terminus a quo*. In order to prove that 411 was the starting-point, it is necessary either to produce evidence that P. did not include the period before 411 in his work, or else to prove from considerations of some other kind that he could not have included it. Proof of the former kind is clearly not available, and the indirect proof is far from conclusive. It is argued that as there are references in P. to incidents in the history of the War which are earlier than 411, and as the formula *ὥσπερ εἴρηκά που καὶ πρότερον* is not employed in connexion with these references, it follows that the earlier part of the War cannot have been included within the scope of the work. I admit that P. was not a stylist, but I think he was enough of a stylist to feel that such a formula was not indispensable on every occasion. With regard to the *terminus ad quem*, there is no sort of proof that it was the year 394. So that, if you set aside the argument based upon the absence of this phrase *ὥσπερ εἴρηκά που καὶ πρότερον*, or of any corresponding phrase, the sole basis for this momentous assumption, that the scope of the work was the period from 411 to 394, is a deductive argument, derived from the scale of the work. It is argued that a work so elaborate, and so detailed, cannot have covered a longer period than seventeen years. If once the validity of

this argument can be impugned (my reasons for impugning it will appear later), then it follows that the main argument for identifying P. with Theopompus disappears; and also, of course, the main argument for identifying P.'s work with any continuation of Thucydides. The *terminus a quo* may be any year you please before 411, and the *terminus ad quem* any year down to 356.[1] Our choice of authors is enlarged; but there is only one whose claims can come into serious consideration, and that one is Ephorus.

What then are the arguments that have led all scholars hitherto, with the exception of Judeich, to exclude the claims of Ephorus from consideration? Everybody who was shown the Papyrus, before its publication, at once jumped to the conclusion that it was Ephorus. It was only upon reflection that they were convinced that it could not be Ephorus; and they were convinced by two considerations—the scale, and the method of the work. As to the scale, it was assumed by everybody (and it was this argument that convinced Blass, whose first instinct was to identify it with Ephorus) that the scale of P. was far too elaborate to be that of the scale of a universal history. As to the method, it was argued that Ephorus could not have written synchronistically and annalistically. That view had been stated very emphatically by Schwartz in the article on Ephorus in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*—an opinion which carries the more weight, because the article was written before the discovery of P., and is therefore free from all suspicion of controversial motive. Schwartz goes so far as to say that the one thing that is inconceivable is that Ephorus

[1] Or, on Meyer's view of the internal evidence of the date, down to 346.

could have written annalistically or synchronistically.[1] Laqueur expresses himself with equal confidence—'Ephorus, der niemals synchronistische Geschichte gegeben hatte.'[2] Now what is the evidence for this assumption? In the first place, there is the well-known statement of Diodorus[3] that Ephorus wrote according to subject (κατὰ γένος); and it is assumed that to write κατὰ γένος excludes the possibility of writing annalistically or synchronistically; in other words, that it excludes such a form of composition as we find in P. In the second place, this statement of Diodorus' appears to be confirmed by the phenomena presented by Diodorus' work itself. It is all very well for Judeich to say that we have no evidence that Ephorus wrote κατὰ γένος; I venture to think that we have conclusive evidence. You have only to turn to Book XI of Diodorus, where he is dealing with the earlier half of the period between the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars, in order to find three sufficient proofs of this contention. Under the year 477/6[4] he narrates the history of Pausanias, from his assuming the command of the Panhellenic fleet in 478 down to his death; that is to say, he compresses the events of some eight years into one year. The only explanation that can be suggested is that he found the whole story narrated in Ephorus, in one section just as we find it narrated in Diodorus. Similarly, the history of Themistocles, from the first charge of medism brought against him by the Spartans, before his ostracism, down

[1] Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. vi, '*Ephorus*.'

[2] *Hermes*, 1911, p. 323.

[3] V. 1 Τῶν γὰρ βίβλων ἑκάστην πεποίηκε περιέχειν κατὰ γένος τὰς πράξεις.

[4] Ch. 44 and 45.

to his death, is narrated under the single year 471/70.[1] Once more, the narrative in question covers a space of several years; a fact which can only be explained on the hypothesis that Diodorus found all the events that he here describes in one continuous section in Ephorus. The most striking example of all, however, is to be found in the next year, 470/69, where the campaigns of Cimon, from his appointment to the command of the fleet in the Hellespont down to the battle of the Eurymedon—a period at any rate of some eight years—are all narrated under a single archonship. What, however, has been overlooked is this consideration—that what we are concerned with is not the question of the scale of Ephorus' work in any part of it, or the method of his work in any part of it, but a much simpler one: What was the scale of Ephorus' work, and what was his method, for this period of his history; i.e., for the opening years of the fourth century?

The questions therefore that await an answer may be formulated as follows. Firstly, What was the scale of Ephorus' work for the fourth century? This will be found to involve the two further questions, What was the scope of his eighteenth book, of which P. must be a fragment, if it is a fragment of any part of Ephorus? and, What was the probable length of a book of Ephorus? When these two questions have been answered, another question will remain: What would have been the probable length of P., if we had P. intact for the period covered by the eighteenth book of Ephorus? The last question to be considered is this: How far is it possible to determine the scale upon which Ephorus wrote, from a comparison of Ephorus with Xenophon, where we can compare them? When we

[1] Ch. 54-58.

have answered all these questions, we shall be in a better position to decide the question of authorship.

What then was the scale of Ephorus' work for the fourth century? The fragments of Ephorus which relate to the fourth century are, unfortunately, few in number, and it is only in comparatively few of these that the book is given. It is no easy matter, therefore, to determine the scope of this particular book. We can, however, arrive at a general idea of the number of years covered by a given number of books. In Book XVII of Ephorus, as we learn from Diodorus,[1] the death of Alcibiades was described. His death occurred in the Attic year 404/3. It is not at all clear, however, from the passage in Diodorus that the death of Alcibiades may not have been narrated in connexion with the expedition of the Ten Thousand (401 B.C.), by way of a digression. The only difference that this would make would be that, in the one case, the year 404/3 must be included in Book XVII, whereas, in the other case, the *terminus a quo* of the book might conceivably be a year or two later. In Book XVIII Ephorus narrated the campaign of Dercylidas,[2] in 399; in Book XX the *διοικισμός* of Mantinea, in the year 385.[3] In Book XXV he narrated the battle of Mantinea, in 362.[4] I think there can be little doubt that the battle of Mantinea formed the ending of Book XXV. It follows that we get for a period of forty years, or possibly forty-two years, some eight books; which gives an average of a little over five years for a book. There is no reason to think that Sicilian affairs were dealt with in these books; it

[1] XIV. 11. 2.
[2] Fragm. 130.
[3] Fragm. 138.
[4] Fragm. 146 *a*.

is probable that they dealt solely with the affairs of Greece. After the battle of Mantinea, it seems as if the scale became larger. Apparently not more than two or three years were covered in each of the later books. This is, I think, a pretty certain conclusion. If this is so, his treatment of his subject must have become fuller as he came nearer to his own time. You will find the evidence summarized in Schwartz's article on Ephorus, or in my own paper in *Klio*.[1] Taking these data as affording a rough indication, we might assume that a book of Ephorus which included the year 395, which forms the subject of our fragment, would probably include at least four years, and might include five, but hardly more than five. Of course, this would be quite a rough estimate.

Let us now attempt to determine more precisely the limits of Book XVIII of Ephorus.

Harpocration tells us[2] that the Athenian general Hieronymus was mentioned by Ephorus in Book XVIII, and again in Book XIX. Hieronymus occurs both in P. and in Diodorus; in P. (ch. x. 2) in connexion with the revolution at Rhodes, and in Diodorus (XIV. 81) in connexion with Conon's visit to Babylon. Hence Book XVIII certainly included the year 395. Two explanations are possible in regard to the mention of his name in Book XIX. The occasion may be identical with that in Diodorus; i.e. it may be the visit of Conon to Babylon towards the end of 395. This might suggest that the dividing line between Books XVIII and XIX is to be drawn between the mention of Hieronymus in P., in the earlier half of 395, and the mention of him by Diodorus, towards the end of the same year. If this inference were correct, it would be

[1] *Klio*, viii (1908).

[2] Ephorus, Fragm. 135.

a probable conclusion that Book XVIII of Ephorus terminated with the end of Agesilaus' second campaign, when he went into winter quarters late in 395, the point at which P. breaks off. If we confine ourselves to this evidence alone, that would be quite a possible ending for the eighteenth book of Ephorus. On other grounds, however, as you will see later, it is not a probable ending. The alternative explanation connects the mention of his name in Book XIX with a passage in the *Hellenics* of Xenophon,[1] in which Nicophemus, who is coupled with Hieronymus both in P. and Diodorus, is stated to have been appointed by Pharnabazus and Conon as harmost of Cythera, during the operations in the Aegean in 393. It is quite possible that Hieronymus played a part, as well as Nicophemus, in these operations: and it is possible, therefore, that Ephorus mentioned Hieronymus in Book XIX in this context. If so, we get the dividing line between Books XVIII and XIX somewhere between 395 and 393, and that is much the more probable conclusion; only, of course, there is direct evidence for Hieronymus at the end of 395, while there is no actual evidence for him in 393. It is merely a conjecture that he may have been associated with Nicophemus in the operations of that year. For the *terminus a quo* of the book Judeich suggests the dispatch of Dercylidas to Asia Minor in the latter part of 399, and for the *terminus ad quem* the battle of Cnidus. This *terminus ad quem* has been very generally accepted; e.g. by Schwartz. I venture, however, to think that both suggestions are erroneous; I cannot accept either the *terminus a quo* or the *terminus ad quem*. About the *terminus a quo* there can hardly

[1] IV. 8. 8.

be a doubt that it cannot be the dispatch of Dercylidas to Asia Minor; it must be the rupture between Sparta and Persia, and the dispatch of his predecessor, Thibron. For a book, whose subject was the war between Sparta and Persia in Asia Minor, the starting-point can only have been the sending of the first force and the first commander. I am equally clear as to the *terminus ad quem.* It is not the battle of Cnidus; it is the recall of Agesilaus. The decision to recall Agesilaus meant the formal abandonment of the crusade on which Sparta had entered, and the formal renunciation of the defence of the Greek cities in Asia Minor against the barbarians. This decision, therefore, rather than the battle of Cnidus, was the natural ending for a book which started with Thibron, and had as its subject the war between Sparta and Persia. This conclusion derives strong support from an examination of the text of Diodorus. In the preface to Book XIV,[1] the loss of the Spartan *ἀρχή* is stated to form part of its theme. The precise words are as follows: *Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ περιποιησάμενοι τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀρχὴν ἀναμφισβήτητον, τότε ταύτης ἐστερήθησαν.* What moment does Diodorus intend by *τότε*? The answer to this question is to be found in chapter 82. 2, 3: *μισουμένων γὰρ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ὑπὸ τῶν συμμάχων διὰ τὸ βάρος τῆς ἐπιστασίας, ᾤοντο ῥᾳδίως καταλύσειν αὐτῶν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν . . . καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συνέδριον κοινὸν ἐν τῇ Κορίνθῳ συστησάμενοι τοὺς βουλευσομένους ἔπεμπον . . . μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα . . . πολλοὺς συμμάχους ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀπέστησαν.* This passage renders it clear that Diodorus intended by the phrase *τότε ταύτης ἐστερήθησαν*, not the battle of Cnidus, but the first congress of the anti-Laconian league at Corinth, and

[1] XIV. 2. 1.

the consequent resolution of the Spartan government to recall Agesilaus. If you look at these two passages in Diodorus, I think you will be quite convinced that that is what Diodorus meant. Nor is there in Diodorus' narrative any trace whatever that the battle of Cnidus formed a break in the story. My own view, therefore, is that the *terminus a quo* is the dispatch of Thibron, and the *terminus ad quem* the decision on the part of the Spartan government to recall Agesilaus. This gives us, then, the answer to our first question, that of the scope of Book XVIII of Ephorus.

The next question to be answered is this: Can we determine the probable length of a book of Ephorus? It is natural to turn to Xenophon in the first instance, because he includes the period covered by P., and by Book XVIII of Ephorus. Book III of Xenophon's *Hellenics* is 1,000 lines long, and the longest book in the *Hellenics* is only 1,300 lines in length. If these figures afforded us any probable indication of the length of a book of Ephorus, it is clear that the claims of Ephorus need not further detain us. What, however, are the figures for the other two classical historians? When we turn to Thucydides we find that the average is 2,300 lines, and that one book runs to 2,800 lines. In Herodotus, one book, Book VII, runs to 3,500 lines, and another, Book I, to 3,700 lines. Here, no doubt, we are dealing with authors who did not themselves divide their works into books. The division was made in the Alexandrine period, it is true; but none the less it is evidence, because it shows what people in the Alexandrine period thought a reasonable length for a book. But, clearly, the evidence is much better when it is derived from works in which the division into books proceeded from the author's own hand. I propose to

turn, first of all, to Diodorus; and to Diodorus for two reasons. Firstly, he, like Ephorus, wrote a universal history; secondly, as he had Ephorus before him, nothing is more natural than that he should have been guided by the length of a book of Ephorus in determining the length of one of his own books. So entirely imitative is Diodorus. Now, what are the facts? If we take the third pentad of Diodorus from Book XI to Book XV (that is, the books which include this period), we find that the average length of a book is 3,500 lines, while two books run to 4,300 lines. We may turn next to still better evidence, the evidence of Polybius. If Ephorus was the first historian of whom it can be said with certainty that the division into books was due to the author himself, Polybius is the first extant author of whom the same can be said. There are five books of Polybius which are complete. The average length of those five is 3,700 lines; the last book, Book V, runs to 4,100, and Book III runs to 4,600 lines. If a book of Polybius runs to 4,500 lines and more, I can see no reason why a book of Ephorus may not have run to 4,500 lines also. And now let us attempt to get back to the age of Ephorus himself. Let us take his great contemporary, Theopompus. If you turn to fragment 25 (*b*) [1] you will find a passage from Photius' *Bibliotheca*,[2] which contains a long excerpt from the first book of Theopompus' *Philippica*. Theopompus is, among other things, boasting of his literary output before he had set hand to the *Philippica*. He tells us that his *ἐπιδεικτικοὶ λόγοι*, his oratorical works, ran to more than 20,000 lines, and his *Hellenica* to 150,000 lines. These are his words: *οὐκ ἐλαττόνων μὲν ἢ δισμυρίων*

[1] Fragm. 25 (*b*) G. and H.; in Müller's edition, fragm. 26.
[2] 176 (ed. Bekker, p. 120).

ἐπῶν τοὺς ἐπιδεικτικοὺς τῶν λόγων συγγραψαμένῳ, πλείους δὲ ἢ ιε΄ μυριάδας, ἐν οἷς τάς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων πράξεις μέχρι νῦν ἀπαγγελλομένας ἔστι λαβεῖν. That is clearly a reference to the *Hellenica*. Thus the twelve books of the *Hellenica* ran to 150,000 lines. But what was the length of a line in a manuscript of the age of Theopompus? That is not easy to determine. In verse, the extreme limit was given by the hexameter line, but for prose there is no such standard available. If we take the extant papyri of every age, we find that the number of letters in a line varies from upwards of forty (this is the case with the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*) to an average as low as fifteen, which is found in a papyrus fragment of the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates.[1] As the lines in the printed text of the Oxford edition of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* contain, on the average, forty-five letters, the highest average gives us a line approximately equal to a line of the printed text, while the lowest average gives us a line which is one-third the length of the printed line. Even if we assume that the lines of which Theopompus spoke (he was boasting, and therefore he might have selected the shortest he could find) were lines of fifteen letters only, that is, that they were a third the length of our printed lines, we shall get a minimum of 50,000 lines for the twelve books, or more than 4,000 lines to a book—a striking confirmation of my own calculation for Ephorus. If it is argued that a work on such a scale as is implied in twenty-nine books, with an average of something like 4,000 lines apiece (i.e. 116,000 lines in all), is inconceivable for Ephorus, it may fairly be replied that this total, formidable as it may appear, must have

[1] *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v, pp. 292 ff.

been exceeded by the *Philippica* of Theopompus. If 4,000 lines are allowed for each of the fifty-seven books, the total will be as high as 230,000 lines; if the average of a book is put as low as 2,000 lines, the total will still approximate to that which we have argued for Ephorus. I think, therefore, that I am justified in assuming that a length of 4,500 lines for a particular book is entirely consistent with the scale of a universal history extending to twenty-nine books.

To come now to the third question, Can we determine the probable length of P. for the period covered by Book XVIII of Ephorus; i.e. from the beginning of 399 to the beginning of 394, a period of five years?

What is the length of the extant portion of P.? I propose to limit my calculation to the three last sections—B, C, and D. I omit A altogether from the calculation, for the very simple reason that the correct position of A is a matter of dispute. Let us take the three last sections, from chapter vi to the end, which cover the period from the spring of 395 to the moment when Agesilaus went into winter quarters at the end of the year. The number of extant lines, whether perfect or incomplete, in these sections is a little over 600. There is evidence for another 50. That makes 650 in all. One or two columns are probably lost, but, in Dr. Hunt's opinion, not more than one or two. For these we may allow another 100 lines; and that will give us a total of 750 lines. From the second campaign of Agesilaus to his recall (the *terminus ad quem* which I have assumed for Ephorus) we have to allow for the following events:[1] the battle of Haliartus, Conon's

[1] A certain inference from Diod. XIV. 81–83. 1.

mission to the Persian court, the formation of the anti-Laconian league in Greece, the operations in northern Greece (Thessaly, Heraclea, Phocis), and, lastly, the recall of Agesilaus. If we allow for these incidents two-thirds as much, say, 500 lines, the allowance will be a liberal one, I think. That will give us, for the period from the beginning of 395 to the spring of 394, a total of some 1,250 lines. Now let us work backward. The year 395 was an exceptionally heavy year, because it included, not only operations of an important character both on land and sea, but also two campaigns of Agesilaus, as well as exceedingly important events in Greece. In the year 396 there was only one brief campaign of Agesilaus. The naval operations, it is true, were important — perhaps more important than in the succeeding year; but there appear to have been no incidents of importance in Greece itself, if we may draw any inference from the silence of Diodorus. In other words, it was comparatively a light year. Let us allow for it 800 lines. For the two preceding years, 397 and 398—the years of Dercylidas' command—1,000 lines would be a generous allowance, seeing that Dercylidas was mainly occupied in making truces. Finally, if we allow 500 or 600 lines for Thibron, we shall get for the period covered by Book XVIII of Ephorus a total of something like 3,500 lines. Such a calculation, of course, advances no claim to accuracy. It is more than probable that there were events recorded by Ephorus which have left no trace in the narrative of Diodorus; but there is a surplus of 1,000 lines to play with, and that is more than sufficient to meet any reasonable demand.

Before I can proceed to attempt an answer to the next question, I must deal with an objection that is

likely to be advanced against the value of these calculations. My assumption has been that Book XVIII of Ephorus started with the dispatch of Thibron to the coast of Asia Minor, at the beginning of the winter of 400/399. In the third book, however, of Xenophon's *Hellenics* there are two events that are narrated at considerable length, which are placed by Xenophon after the dispatch of Thibron; namely, the Spartan invasion of Elis, and the conspiracy of Cinadon. I anticipate that it may be urged that in my calculation I ought to have allowed a considerable number of lines for both of these incidents. As to the former of these, the Spartan invasion of Elis, it is certain that it was narrated by Ephorus, and I think it may be inferred from the account in Diodorus that it was narrated in considerable detail; but it is also certain from Diodorus that it was narrated, not in Book XVIII of Ephorus, if that book began with Thibron's expedition, but in Book XVII. This is apparent, both from the chronology of Diodorus, and from the order in which he narrates the events of that period. So far as the chronology goes, he puts the invasion of Elis in the year 402/1, the conclusion of peace between Sparta and Elis in the year 401/400, and the expedition of Thibron in the year 400/399. The first and the last of these dates are indisputably correct: the war with Elis began in the year 402/1, and the expedition of Thibron was in the year 400/399. If there is any error in Diodorus' chronology, it is that the conclusion of peace was probably in the year 399, and not in the year 400. Therefore, quite clearly on that showing, the Spartan invasion of Elis would have been narrated in Book XVII, and not in Book XVIII, of Ephorus. That inference is confirmed by the order in which the events

are placed by Diodorus. Between the outbreak of the war and the invasion of Elis, on the one hand, and the conclusion of peace, on the other, Diodorus narrates the expedition of the Ten Thousand and, oddly enough, the overthrow of the Thirty at Athens; and between the conclusion of peace and the dispatch of Thibron to Asia Minor he narrates the expulsion of the Messenians from Cephallenia.[1] Clearly then, the Spartan invasion of Elis formed no part of the eighteenth book of Ephorus. Next, as to the conspiracy of Cinadon. It is narrated at length in Xenophon, but there is no evidence that it was narrated at all by Ephorus. There is, at any rate, no mention of it in Diodorus; though, of course, that is not conclusive. But it is quite likely that Ephorus may have entirely omitted it, or may have narrated it very briefly. As will be seen presently, Meyer admits that, while P. had very full sources of information for Boeotia and for Athens, he does not betray any trace of information derived from purely Spartan sources.

Finally, can we determine the scale of Ephorus relatively to the scale of Xenophon?

There is, unfortunately, only one passage which permits of a direct comparison between the two authors. This is a fragment (130) of Ephorus, relating to Dercylidas, which can be compared with the corresponding sentence in the *Hellenics*.[2] Ephorus and Xenophon are both concerned with the explanation of the nickname Sisyphus, which was given to Dercylidas, and this is how they respectively explain it.

[1] Diod. XIV. 17. 2–12; 19–31; 32, 33; 34; 36.
[2] Xen. *Hell.* III. 1. 8.

Xenophon.	Ephorus.
Ἀνὴρ δοκῶν εἶναι μάλα μηχανητικός· καὶ ἐπεκαλεῖτο δὲ Σίσυφος.	(Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . Δερκυλίδαν ἔπεμψαν) ἀκούοντες ὅτι πάντα πράττειν εἰώθασιν οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν βάρβαροι μετὰ ἀπάτης καὶ δόλου. Διόπερ Δερκυλίδαν ἔπεμψαν ἥκιστα νομίζοντες ἐξαπατηθήσεσθαι· ἦν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ τρόπῳ Λακωνικὸν οὐδὲ ἁπλοῦν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ πολὺ τὸ πανοῦργον καὶ τὸ θηριῶδες. Διὸ καὶ Σίσυφον[1] αὐτὸν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προσηγόρευον.

Xenophon does it in 9 words, and Ephorus in 44; a slight but significant piece of evidence. But we can arrive at a comparison of the scale of Ephorus and Xenophon indirectly, on other evidence; namely, from a comparison of the descriptions given by Diodorus and Xenophon respectively of three of the battles in the last period of the Peloponnesian War—Abydos, Cyzicus, and Arginusae. In Diodorus the battle of Abydos occupies 90 lines, in Xenophon 25; the battle of Cyzicus, 125 lines in Diodorus and 45 in Xenophon; the battle of Arginusae, down to the defeat of the Spartans (i.e. not including the failure to rescue the survivors and to recover the dead), in Diodorus takes 110 lines and in Xenophon 45 lines. Now, no doubt some features in the descriptions of these battles may have been added by Diodorus; on the other hand, it must be remembered that Diodorus is epitomizing Ephorus. A description which ran to 110 lines in Diodorus must certainly have run to not less than 110, probably to a great deal more than 110, in Ephorus. If,

[1] A certain correction for Σκύθον, the reading of the MSS.

therefore, we can draw any inference from these comparisons, we find that Ephorus was something like three times, or from two to three times, as diffuse as Xenophon in his descriptions. But the comparison does not end here. A glance at Diodorus shows us that, while Xenophon is silent as to the naval operations down to the beginning of the year 394, they bulk very large in Ephorus. Further also, we see from Diodorus that Ephorus narrated many incidents in the history of Greece proper, of which not one word is to be found in Xenophon; that is to say, he dealt with a far wider range of subject. If, therefore, Xenophon covered four years in 1,000 lines, it is not an extravagant assumption — it is a fairly certain inference — that Ephorus must have devoted something like 3,000 lines, at least, to these four years, and, consequently, something approaching 4,000 lines to the five years covered in Book XVIII. Any argument, therefore, against the claims of Ephorus, which is based upon the supposed scale of his work, breaks down completely. So far from the argument from the scale being an argument against his claims, it is an argument, and a very strong argument, in favour of them.

We have disposed of the question of scale. We must now turn to the question of method. Our starting-point must be the well-known passage in the preface to Book V of Diodorus,[1] to which I have already referred. Diodorus there says that Ephorus was successful, not only in his literary treatment of the subject, but also in the arrangement of his matter: *Ἔφορος δὲ τὰς κοινὰς πράξεις ἀναγράφων, οὐ μόνον κατὰ τὴν λέξιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐπιτέτευχε· τῶν γὰρ βίβλων ἑκάστην πεποίηκε περιέχειν κατὰ γένος τὰς πράξεις.* It is argued that this

[1] V. 1. 4.

passage proves conclusively that Ephorus wrote according to subject and not synchronistically, and that a treatment of a subject which is κατὰ γένος excludes the treatment of a subject which is synchronistic. It is further argued that, as the treatment of the subject in P. is synchronistic, our fragment cannot be from the pen of Ephorus. Schwartz, in his article on Ephorus in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, writing before the discovery of P., says that of one thing we may be certain, 'that Ephorus did not write annalistically.' With this we may compare Laqueur's confident assertion, 'One thing that is certain is that Ephorus did not write synchronistically.'[1] In this argument I find an assumption which I cannot admit—that a treatment κατὰ γένος excludes a synchronistic treatment. If Thucydides had followed the method of Ephorus and all later writers, and had divided his work into books, he might have made a single book out of Books VI and VII, and everybody would, of course, have admitted that it satisfied the conditions of a composition κατὰ γένος; i.e. that there was a unity of subject in Books VI and VII. Yet the plan which Thucydides follows in those two books is just as synchronistic as the method of P. Thucydides passes from one scene to the other—from Athens to Sicily, and from Sicily to Sparta —according to the chronology.

A still stronger case is to be found in Book VIII. If Thucydides had lived to continue his narrative down to the battle of Cyzicus, Book VIII would have been an example of a book composed κατὰ γένος; there would have been an essential unity of subject in the book. Yet throughout Book VIII the treatment is entirely synchronistic; the narrative passes from

[1] *Hermes*, 1911, p. 323.

one subject to another, and from one scene to another. In both these cases, therefore, you have an example of a writer who is synchronistic, if any writer ever was so, and yet in both cases there is an essential unity of subject. And an assertion of this kind must be tested by evidence. As I have already pointed out, there can be no question that Ephorus, in his treatment of the period between the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars, did not write synchronistically, and did write *κατὰ γένος*. What evidence is there, however, that this holds good for this period of his history? Let us take Diodorus' narrative of the events of the year with which we are dealing, the year 395, and carry it down to the beginning of 394. We find in Diodorus—and Diodorus, therefore, found in Ephorus—the following order of events: the first campaign of Agesilaus, the overthrow of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes, the outbreak of the war in Phocis and the battle of Haliartus, Conon's journey to the Persian court, the formation of the anti-Laconian confederacy, and the desultory operations in Northern Greece. If that is not a synchronistic method, I do not know what is. But we have better evidence still. Let us turn to the year 394, one of the most important in all Greek history. What is the order of events in Diodorus for that year? You have the Congress at Corinth, followed by the resolution of the Spartan government to recall Agesilaus; then the battle of Nemea; the homeward march of Agesilaus (which was clearly described in detail in Ephorus) through Thrace, Macedonia, and Thessaly, as far as Thermopylae; the battle of Cnidus; the battle of Coronea; the operations of Conon and Pharnabazus in the Aegean. He passes from Corinth to Sparta, from the Peloponnese to Northern Greece, from Europe

to Asia, from the operations on land to the operations by sea, and back from the operations by sea to the operations on land. A more synchronistic treatment of a period could not well be conceived. Let us now compare it with P. If we start from chapter vi, and leave out section A altogether, what do we find? The order of the events which he narrates is as follows: the first campaign of Agesilaus; the overthrow of Tissaphernes; the revolution at Rhodes; the outbreak of the war between Phocis and Thebes, with the digression on the Theban constitution; then the mutiny of the Cypriotes in Conon's fleet; and, finally, the second campaign of Agesilaus. The parallel is strikingly exact. In the one case we pass from the deliberations of the allies to the deliberations of the Spartans, in the other we pass from the Greek camp to the Persian court; and in Diodorus we pass from the operations on land to the operations by sea, just as in P. we pass from the land campaign to the naval operations. In P., as in Diodorus, we pass from Asia Minor to Europe; then we pass back to the naval operations, precisely as we do in Diodorus in 394; and then from the naval operations back once again to the operations by land, exactly as in Diodorus. Put them in two columns side by side, and the parallel could hardly be more striking.

P., 395.	Diodorus (Ephorus), 394.
First campaign of Agesilaus (Asia: land warfare).	Congress of the Allies (Corinth).
Overthrow of Tissaphernes (Asia).	Recall of Agesilaus (Sparta).
Revolution at Rhodes (Asia: naval warfare).	Battle of Nemea (Peloponnese).
Phocis and Thebes (Europe).	Homeward march of Agesilaus (Northern Greece).
	Battle of Cnidus (Asia: naval warfare).

Cypriote mutiny (Asia: naval warfare).	Battle of Coronea (Europe: land warfare).
Second campaign of Agesilaus (Asia: land warfare).	Conon and Pharnabazus in the Aegean (naval warfare).

There can be but one conclusion. Whatever Ephorus may have done in other parts of his history, for this period, which is the only period that is relevant to the issue, his method was synchronistic, precisely in the sense in which the method of P. is synchronistic. There is, it is true, an assumption which underlies my argument. I have assumed that the order in Diodorus corresponds to the order in Ephorus. But what is the alternative to this assumption? It is this: that Ephorus wrote *κατὰ γένος*, and that Diodorus pulled his narrative to pieces, and stuck the pieces together again in synchronistic form. Other historians might have been capable of achieving such a feat; what is quite certain is that Diodorus was unable to achieve it. You have only to turn to any of the passages in which Ephorus clearly wrote *κατὰ γένος* to see the startling results at which Diodorus could arrive with the aid of his Dictionary of Dates.[1]

The questions which we set out to discuss have now been answered, and the two assumptions which seemed so fatal to the claims of Ephorus have been disposed of: the assumption as to the scale of his work, and the assumption as to his method. They were assumptions which were universally accepted, but they were accepted without being examined.

[1] e.g. Diod. XI. 44, 45; 54–58; 60–62.

LECTURE III

THE CASE FOR EPHORUS

My object in the last lecture was to clear the ground for the consideration of the claims of Ephorus by an examination of the two assumptions which had hitherto been regarded as fatal to those claims. Having thus disposed of the negative arguments, we are free to proceed to the discussion of the positive arguments in favour of the identification of P. with Ephorus.

The first argument to be discussed in the present lecture is the argument from coincidence. It will be concerned with the indirect coincidences between P. and Ephorus; i.e. with the coincidences which can be established between P. and those authors who excerpted Ephorus: with coincidences, that is to say, not between Ephorus, at first hand, and P., but between Ephorus, at second hand, and P.

I propose to start with a comparison of Diodorus and P. On comparing the two narratives, we find, at the first glance, that the choice of subjects in Ephorus coincided with the choice of subjects in P.; and secondly, that so far as our evidence extends, the order in which these subjects were treated by Ephorus was the order in which they are treated by P.[1] The following are the subjects and their order in P.: (1) the first campaign of Agesilaus, (2) the overthrow of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes, (3) the revolution at Rhodes, (4) the outbreak of the war in Phocis, (5) the mutiny of the

[1] Here, again, I omit section A and start with section B.

Cypriotes at Caunus, and (6) the second campaign of Agesilaus. In Diodorus we have (1) the first campaign of Agesilaus, (2) the overthrow of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes, and (3) the outbreak of the war in Phocis; three out of the six. It results, therefore, that three of these events were narrated by Ephorus, and that they were narrated in the same order. But we have evidence for a fourth—the mutiny of the Cypriotes; for the only other passage in ancient literature in which it is referred to is a passage in Justin;[1] and, as Justin is admitted to go back ultimately to Ephorus, the reference to it in Justin proves that the account of the mutiny at Caunus stood in Ephorus. Nobody, of course, has ever suggested that Ephorus did not describe the second campaign of Agesilaus in 395. That it was omitted by Diodorus is to be explained by the simple fact that Diodorus is Diodorus. Two conclusions, therefore, are indisputable; firstly, that out of the six incidents which we find in P., five were in Ephorus; and secondly, that three of them were narrated by Ephorus in the same order in which we find them in P.

But the coincidence does not end here. The comparison has been carried, so far, only to the end of P. It may be carried beyond that point. In Diodorus, who, as has been pointed out, omits the second campaign of Agesilaus, the order of events, after the fall of Tissaphernes, is the following: (1) the quarrel between Phocis and Boeotia, (2) the Boeotian War down to the battle of Haliartus, and (3) the journey of Conon to Babylon. Meyer admits that this order—the order in Diodorus—was almost certainly the order in P.; that is to say, that in P. the winter campaign of

[1] VI. 2. 11.

Agesilaus, where P. ends, was followed by the Boeotian War and the battle of Haliartus, and that this was followed by Conon's journey to Babylon. Thus he admits, in effect, that P., having carried the narrative of Agesilaus' campaign in Asia Minor down to the beginning of winter, went back some few months to the outbreak of the war in Greece, carried on the story down to the battle of Haliartus in the autumn, and then narrated Conon's journey, which belongs to the end of the autumn of 395. That is to say, the order in Diodorus is the correct chronological order, and therefore would be entirely in accordance with the plan discernible in P. This constitutes an important advance; for now we are in a position to say, not merely that five of the six subjects narrated by P. were in Ephorus, and that three of them stood in the same order, but that of eight subjects narrated by P., seven were in Ephorus, and six of the seven in the same order.

The extent and significance of these coincidences can be seen at a glance when they are exhibited in parallel columns.

P.	Ephorus.
(1) First campaign of Agesilaus.	(1) First campaign of Agesilaus.
(2) Overthrow of Tissaphernes.	(2) Overthrow of Tissaphernes.
(3) Revolution at Rhodes.	
(4) Origin of Boeotian War.	(3) Origin of Boeotian War.
(5) Mutiny of Cypriotes.	(4) Mutiny of Cypriotes (Justin).
(6) Second campaign of Agesilaus.	(5) [Second campaign of Agesilaus.]
(7) [Boeotian War to Haliartus.]	(6) Boeotian War to Haliartus.
(8) [Conon's journey to Babylon.]	(7) Conon's journey to Babylon.

Now, if the hypothesis is correct that Diodorus derived his account from Ephorus, and that Ephorus

derived his account from Theopompus, and that Theopompus is P., this coincidence between Ephorus and Theopompus is quite extraordinary. It seems, not only that Ephorus must have followed Theopompus, but that he must have followed him in the most servile and mechanical fashion conceivable; and this implies a relation between Ephorus and Theopompus of which ancient literature knows nothing.

This coincidence between Ephorus and P. becomes still more striking when we pass to details. I propose to take three examples only from P. The first is the first campaign of Agesilaus, the second is the assassination of Tissaphernes, and the third is a passage in section A [1] relating to the composition of the Persian fleet.

The passage which is relatively the fullest both in P. and Diodorus is the first of these, that which relates to the first campaign of Agesilaus in 395 and the victory at Sardis. It is here, therefore, that comparison is easiest. It must be remembered, however, that Diodorus' account is concise, and that the earlier half of the account in P. is excessively fragmentary. What then are the coincidences which can be traced, in spite of these conditions? In the first place, according to Diodorus,[2] Agesilaus marched through the Plain of the Cayster and the region of Mount Sipylus (τὸ Καΰστρου πεδίον καὶ τὴν περὶ Σίπυλον χώραν); in the fragmentary lines of P. we read τὸ] Κα[ΰσ]τρι[ον πεδίον . . . . τὰ ὄρη ταξάμε[νος. No one questions that Sipylus stood there, as well as the Plain of the Cayster. This is almost immediately followed in Diodorus by the words ἐπηκολούθει τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις. In

[1] The order in which section A should be placed is here not relevant to the issue.

[2] Diod. XIV. 80; *Hell. Oxyrh.* vi.

the parallel passage in P. the words [ἐπηκο]λούθει τοῖς Ἕλλησιν can be read. Agesilaus is then stated in Diodorus to have marched in a hollow square: *εἰς πλινθίον συντάξας τοὺς στρατιώτας.* That the equivalent of this stood in P. is certain from the occurrence of the words [ἔξ]ωθεν τοῦ πλιν[θίου a few lines farther on. The battle, again, both in Diodorus and in P., is decided by a body of troops placed in ambush (*ὅπως ἐνεδρεύσῃ τοὺς βαρβάρους . . . τὴν ἐνέδραν παρήλλαξεν*, Diod.; *ἀνα[στήσ]ας ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας* in P.), and in both versions Tissaphernes is present at the battle. Finally, Diodorus states that after the victory Agesilaus attempted to march inland, but that on finding the omens unfavourable he returned to the coast: *ἐπεχείρησε μὲν εἰς τὰς ἄνω σατραπείας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς οὐ δυνάμενος καλλιερῆσαι πάλιν ἀπήγαγε τὴν δύναμιν ἐπὶ θάλατταν.* In P., though the papyrus is very fragmentary at this point, we can undoubtedly read that Agesilaus marched into Phrygia, and then, on finding the omens unfavourable, returned to the sea:

> *Ἐθύετο πότερα χ[ρὴ] δ[ι]αβ[αίνειν τὸν ποτα]μὸν ἢ μή, καὶ βαδίζειν ἐπὶ Κελα[ινὰς ἢ πάλιν τ]οὺς στρατιώτας ἀπάγειν. ὡς δὲ συνέβ[αινεν αὐτῷ] μὴ γίγνεσθαι καλὰ τὰ ἱερά, περιμείνα[ς ἐκεῖ τήν τ]ε ἡμέραν ἣν παρεγένετο καὶ τὴν ἐπιο[ῦσαν ἀπῆγ]εν τὸν [στρατὸν . . . . Ἀγησί]λαος μὲν οὖ[ν . . . . τὸ πεδίον τὸ Μαιάν]δρου καλούμενον.*

Here then there are seven points essential to the story, in each one of which there is complete agreement between Diodorus and P., and absolute disagreement with Xenophon's parallel narrative. Indeed, Xenophon's account has nothing in common with the account in P. and Diodorus, except the defeat of the Persians and the plunder of the camp. The question has often been raised as to how far Diodorus rewrote Ephorus. In the description of the plunder of the camp we have

an excellent example of the way in which Diodorus translated the language of his authority into the language of his own age. The passage runs as follows in P.:

Ἐπακολουθήσαντες δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις οὐ λίαν πολὺν χρόνον, . . . καταβάλλουσιν μὲν αὐτῶν περὶ ἑξακοσίους, ἀποστάντες δὲ τῆς διώξεως ἐβάδιζον ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ τῶν βαρβάρων. καταλαβόντες δὲ φυλακὴν οὐ σπουδαί[ως κ]αθε[στῶ]-σαν ταχέως αἱροῦσιν, καὶ λαμβάνουσιν αὐτῶν [πολ]λὴν μὲν ἀγορὰν συχνοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπους, πολλὰ δὲ σκεύη καὶ χρήματα.

It becomes in Diodorus, XIV. 80. 4:

Οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀγησίλαον μέχρι μέν τινος ἐπιδιώξαντες, ἀνεῖλον μὲν ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑξακισχιλίους, αἰχμαλώτων δὲ πολὺ πλῆθος ἤθροισαν· τὴν δὲ παρεμβολὴν διήρπασαν, γέμουσαν πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν.

Yet it is here, in the narrative of Agesilaus' first campaign, that Meyer claims to have discovered discrepancies which disprove for ever the hypothesis that Ephorus is P. Between the narrative in Diodorus and the narrative in P. he finds discrepancies, which, he asserts, are only to be explained by the hypothesis that Ephorus, the intermediary, while closely following the narrative of P., varied it in detail. The first of these discrepancies relates to the number of the slain. It is given in P. as 600, in Diodorus as 6,000. This is, according to Meyer, a characteristic example of the Ephorean method. It is, I think, a simpler hypothesis to assume a slip on the part of Diodorus, or, more likely, of a copyist. Ancient literature teems with parallel examples. The second discrepancy is, perhaps, rather more serious; only, unfortunately, P. is so fragmentary at this point, that it is difficult to determine what stood there. It relates to the number of troops under Tissaphernes. In Diodorus the numbers are given as 10,000 foot and 50,000 horse (*μυρίους μὲν*

ἱππεῖς, πεντακισμυρίους δὲ πεζοὺς ἀθροίσας). In P. the Editors read as follows: [*ἱππέας μὲν . . . α*]*κισχιλίους καὶ μυ*[*ρίους, πεζοὺς δὲ . . . . . . μυρίων ο*]*ὐκ ἐλάττους*, and they suggest that *πεντακισμυρίων* may have stood before the words *οὐκ ἐλάττους*. Various other emendations, however, have been proposed. If the Editors' suggestion is correct, Diodorus agrees with P., except that he puts the cavalry at 10,000 instead of 18,000. That again is quite a possible slip on Diodorus' part; nor do I think that any real weight can be attached to it. His next discrepancy relates to the term by which the force of Agesilaus is designated in Diodorus and in P. respectively. In P. the army is described as Ἕλληνες; in Diodorus as *Λακεδαιμόνιοι*. To Theopompus, Meyer argues, it was a national crusade —the Greeks against the Barbarians; to Ephorus it was an affair of purely Spartan policy: Agesilaus had no claim to pose as a Greek hero; he was merely the leader of the Lacedaemonian forces. Unfortunately for this explanation, we have only to read a few lines farther in Diodorus to find that the war is described as *ὁ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας πόλεμος*; while in this very section of P. (ch. vi, vii), though the force, it is true, is commonly called *οἱ Ἕλληνες*, it is twice over called *οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι*.[1]

The next discrepancy, which is concerned with the ambush, is scarcely more formidable. In P. Xenocles is represented as acting on his own initiative; he sallies forth from the ambush when he thinks the right moment has come: *ὁ δὲ Ξενοκλῆς, ἐπειδὴ καιρ*[*ὸν ὑπ*]*έλαβεν εἶναι τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπιχειρεῖν, ἀνα*[*στήσ*]*ας ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας τοὺς Πελοποννησίους ἔθει δρόμῳ*. In Diodorus, on the other hand, he acts in obedience to a signal from Agesilaus: *καὶ τοῦ συσσήμου τοῖς κατὰ τὴν ἐνέδραν οὖσιν ἀρθέντος, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν*

[1] So too at the beginning of ch. xvi, Agesilaus is described as advancing *ἅμα τῷ στρατεύματι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων*.

παιανίσαντες ἐπεφέροντο τοῖς πολεμίοις. Diodorus' descriptions of battles are notoriously conventional, and his phraseology is also conventional—most conventional, perhaps, when he is describing his favourite device of an ambush. I think we may safely treat this detail in Diodorus as part of his stock-in-trade. After all, he is here compressing into two or three lines what occupies a dozen or a score in P.

So far we have encountered nothing that is insuperable. But we now come to a discrepancy which is of a more serious character. In Diodorus three lines are devoted to a description of the plunder of the παράδεισος of Tissaphernes in the neighbourhood of Sardis, and Meyer is certainly within his right in saying that there is no trace of this to be found in P. To this Judeich replies that it need not have occupied more than a couple of lines in P.; and with that I entirely agree. Diodorus does sometimes, when he gets a favourite subject, expand it. But though it need not have occupied more than a couple of lines in P., I should have been better pleased if Judeich had indicated the position of those two lines. It is just possible that room might be found for a brief reference to the παράδεισος in the very fragmentary passage[1] in which the words οὐ]δὲν ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν ποτ[αμόν occur; referring, of course, to Agesilaus' advance along the banks of the Hermus. If, however, this should be judged impossible, then I admit that it is a substantial argument against the identity of P. with Ephorus. It would be, to my mind, the most substantial argument that has yet been advanced. One would have to fall back on the explanation, not an impossible, but not a very probable,

[1] VI. 3, col. v, line 42.

explanation, that Diodorus had transferred to this passage a description of the ravaging of the *παράδεισος* that had occurred elsewhere.

The second passage in which coincidences are to be traced between Ephorus and P. occurs in the description of the plot against Tissaphernes and his execution.[1] It follows in P. immediately on the description of Agesilaus' victory at Sardis. Here we are dealing with a compressed account in Diodorus and with an extremely fragmentary one in P. In P., the most we can hope for is to find a line or two perfect; as a rule we must be content with a word here and a word there. This makes the coincidences the more remarkable. First of all, in Diodorus, as in P., the incident follows immediately on Agesilaus' campaign. In Diodorus, Artaxerxes is said to have been incited by his mother, Parysatis. The Editors think it probable that the first syllable of her name is to be recognized in col. vii. 15.[2] Next follows in Diodorus the statement that Artaxerxes *πρὸς τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς σατράπας ἔπεμψεν ἐπιστολάς* : in P.,[3] *ἀνέπεμψεν ἐπιστολάς* occurs a few lines later on. In the next sentence in Diodorus, Ariaeus is mentioned as the agent of Tithraustes. Similarly, in P. the name of Ariaeus occurs in the next line.[4] Again, in Diodorus' narrative, Tissaphernes was seized in his bath. In P.[5] *ἱμάτια* are mentioned, and in the next line . . .]*νον συναρ*[*πα* . . . is read. The Editors suggest that *νον* may be the last syllable of *λουόμενον* or of *γυμνόν*, and *συναρ.* seems to point to some part of the verb *συναρπάζειν.* The incident of the bath is clearly common to the two

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.*, ch. viii ; Diod. XIV. 80. 6–8.

[2] . . . .]οπ[. . . . . Ἀρταξ]έρξ[. . . . .
. . . .]δια[. . . . .]απαρ[. . . . .

[3] l. 22. [4] l. 23. [5] viii. 2, col. viii. 30.

accounts. Lastly, in Diodorus this incident is followed by the statement that Agesilaus concluded a six months' truce with Tithraustes. This part of the Papyrus is missing, but that the same statement stood there is proved by the words at the beginning of chapter xvi : Ἀγησίλαος . . . βουλόμενος ἐμμένειν ταῖς σπονδαῖς ταῖς πρὸς Τιθραύστην γενομέναις. The cumulative force of these coincidences can best be realized by a comparison of the corresponding passages in the two writers, which are here given in full.

Diodorus XIV. 80, 5–8.

Ἀγησίλαος δ' ἐπεχείρησε μὲν εἰς τὰς ἄνω σατραπείας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς οὐ δυνάμενος καλλιερῆσαι, πάλιν ἀπήγαγε τὴν δύναμιν ἐπὶ θάλατταν. Ἀρταξέρξης δὲ ὁ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεὺς τά τε ἐλαττώματα πυθόμενος, καὶ κατορρωδῶν τὸν πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας πόλεμον, δι' ὀργῆς εἶχε τὸν Τισσαφέρνην. Τοῦτον γὰρ αἴτιον τοῦ πολέμου γεγονέναι ὑπελάμβανε· καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς δὲ Παρυσάτιδος ἦν ἠξιωμένος τιμωρήσασθαι τὸν Τισσαφέρνην· εἶχε γὰρ αὕτη διαφόρως πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐκ τοῦ διαβεβληκέναι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς Κῦρον, ὅτε τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν στρατείαν ἐποιεῖτο. Καταστήσας οὖν Τιθραύστην ἡγεμόνα, τούτῳ μὲν παρήγγειλε συλλαμβάνειν Τισσαφέρνην, πρὸς δὲ τὰς πόλεις καὶ τοὺς σατράπας ἔπεμψεν ἐπιστολάς, ὅπως πάντες τούτῳ ποιῶσι τὸ προσταττόμενον. Ὁ δὲ Τιθραύστης παραγενόμενος εἰς Κολοσσὰς τῆς Φρυγίας, συνέλαβε τὸν Τισσαφέρνην διά τινος Ἀριαίου σατράπου λουόμενον, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποκόψας ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα· αὐτὸς δὲ τὸν Ἀγησίλαον πείσας εἰς λόγους ἐλθεῖν, ἐξαμηνιαίους ἀνοχὰς ἐποιήσατο.

Hell. Oxyrhynchia, col. vi (52)–vii (25).

Ὡς δὲ συνέβ[αινεν αὐτῷ] μὴ γίγνεσθαι καλὰ τὰ ἱερά, περιμείνα[ς ἐκεῖ τήν τ]ε ἡμέραν ἣν παρεγένετο καὶ τὴν ἐπιο[ῦσαν ἀπῆγ]εν τὸν [στρατὸν. . . . .'Ἀγησί]λαος μὲν οὖ[ν. . . . .
. . . . τὸ πεδίον τὸ Μαιάν]δρου καλούμενον δ[. . . . . . .
. . . .] . νέμονται Λυδ[οὶ] κ[. . . . .
. . . .] . δὲ βασιλεὺς . [. . . . .

. . . . π]ερὶ τούτους τ[. . . . .
. . . . στρ]ατηγὸν ἅμα δὲ [. . . . .
. . . .] . Τισσαφέρνῃ ετ[. . . . .
. . . το]ὺς Ἕλληνας οι . [. . . . .
. . .]νον καὶ μᾶλλο[ν . . . .
. . .] . δίχα κειμε[ν . . . .
. . . .]εξ[. . . . .
. . . . . .] συ[. . . . . Τισσ]αφ[έρν . . . .
. . . .]οπ[. . . . . Ἀρταξ]έρξ[. . . . .
. . .]δια[. . . . .]απαρ[. . . . .
. . .]λο[. . . . .]κα[. .]οιτε[. . . . .] . σα[. . . . . . .
. . .]ορΥ[. . . . .] αὐτῷ κατηγ[.] . α[.]α δι[. . . . . .
. . .]σα[. . .]τε βασιλεὺς ὁμολογουντ[. .] μάλιστ[α . . . . .
. . .] δι[ὰ Τισ]σαφέρνην καὶ πα[.]ων ἐκεῖνον [. . . . .
. . .] πάντων καθ' ἃ Τιθρα[ύστης α]ὐτὸν κα[.] . . [. . . . . .
. . . .] ὃς ἐπειδὴ καταφ[. . . . . Φρυ]γίαν καὶ Λυδ[ίαν . . . .
. . .]το[. . . .]εν ἀνέπεμψ[εν ἐπιστ]ολὰς ἃς ἔφερ[ε . . . . . .
. . .]ρα[. . . . . .]ι πρὸς Ἀρι[αῖον Τι]σσαφέρνῃ[. . . . .]
ἐπ[. . . . .]ο πρὸς Με . [. .]αιον ὡς α . [. . . . .]
στ . [. . . .]λαβεῖν ἐκελ[. . .]αιδ[. . . . .]

. . . .

Col. viii.

. . .]ν[– – –]προ[– – –]π' Ἀρταξ[έρξ – – –]τα ἡμέρα[ς – – –]
αὐτὸν α[– – – Φρυ]γίας ἐπια[– – –] τὸν Τιθρ[αύστην – – –
Τισσα]φέρνης [– – –] πρᾶξιν α[– – – οἰ]κοδομε[ῖν – – –] πόλεως .
[– – –] ὑπὸ τῶν [– – –] . ε βαδ[ι – – –] τῷ Τιθρα[ύστῃ – – –]σ[.]
αι παρα[– – –] ἐπιστολὰ[ς – – –] πρὸς τὴν α[– – –]τιας κατα .
[– – –] . ε Μιλη[σι – – –]ψας καὶ τα . [– – – κα]τῆρεν εἰς [– – –]
Ἀριαῖον ε[– – – με]τὰ δὲ ταῦ[τα – – –] διατρίβω[ν – – –] ἱμάτια
τ[– – –]νον συναρ[πα – – –] καὶ μεταπ[– – –]λοι . ν ἱπ[π – – –]
συνεχ[– – –]μεν . [– – –] της δ[– – –] ἔλεγ[ε – – –] τ[ο]ῦ βασιλέως
[– – –] τα[ῖ]ς ἐπιστολ[αῖς – – –]ε τὸ βυβλ[ίον – – –]ττεν βασιλ[ε
– – –] αὐτὸν ἀνα[– – –] . . . ειν εκ . [– – –ἄ]λλην ἀναγ[– – –
τῶ]ν βαρβάρω[ν . . .

Col. xviii (34)-(38).

Ἀγησίλαος δὲ παραπορευόμενος εἰς τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἅμα τῷ στρατεύματι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων, ὅσον

μὲν χρόνον ἐβάδιζε διὰ τῆς Λυδίας, οὐδὲν κακὸν ἐποί[ει τοὺς] ἐνοικοῦντας, βουλόμενος ἐμμένειν ταῖς σπονδαῖς ταῖς πρὸς Τιθραύστην γενομέναις.

The last passage to which I would refer relates to the naval operations at Caunus. It will be found in chapter iv (col. iii (24)–(27)), which forms part of section A. Here, again, P. is very fragmentary. In Diodorus[1] the scene is Caunus; the fleet consists of two divisions, a Cilician and a Phoenician; and the latter is commanded by the King of Sidon (*ὧν ὁ Σιδωνίων δυνάστης εἶχε τὴν ἡγεμονίαν*). In P. the passage runs as follows: *κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐ]τὸν χρόνον Φοινίκων [. . . . . ἧκον ἐνενήκοντ]α νῆες εἰς Καῦνον ὧν [δέκα μὲν ἔπλευσαν ἀπὸ Κιλι]κίας αἱ δὲ λείπουσαι [ἀπὸ . . . .] ἃς Ἄκτων ὁ Σιδώνιος [. . . . . βασ]ιλεῖ.* Caunus, the Cilician and Phoenician divisions, the King of Sidon, all are there, and this in the compass of four or five lines.

We shall find further support for this part of our case if we turn to a series of passages in Diodorus, relating to the period between the year 411 and the year 395, with which P. begins, which are at once peculiar to Diodorus and entirely divergent from the narrative of Xenophon. If we take two passages to which I have already referred—the Spartan invasion of Elis and Thibron's campaign in 399—we shall find that there is little resemblance in either case between the account in Diodorus and the account in Xenophon. Everybody who has discussed those passages (e.g. Busolt, Meyer, and von Mess) assumes that the account in Diodorus goes back ultimately to P.: that is, according to Busolt and Meyer, to Theopompus; according to von Mess, to Cratippus. But when they come to

[1] XIV. 79. 8.

discuss those passages they are compelled to leave Ephorus out of the account. Ephorus, of course, in a sense is there, because it is agreed that Diodorus followed him; he must be there, in order that Diodorus may follow him; but, for all practical purposes, he is eliminated. The relations between Diodorus and P. are treated precisely as if there were no intermediary.[1]

In order to complete the proof, it is necessary to turn to two other authors, Justin and Polyaenus, who present certain extremely remarkable coincidences both with P. and with Diodorus.

In Justin we can point to only a single coincidence, but it is sufficiently remarkable. He is the only other author who refers to the mutiny at Caunus, and in the passage (VI. 2. 11) in which he alludes to it we have an echo of the actual words in P.: 'milites quos praefecti regis fraudare stipendio soliti erant' comes sufficiently near to *ἀναπεισθέντες ὑπό τινων διαβαλλόντων ὡς αὐτοῖς μὲν οὐ μέλλουσιν ἀποδιδόναι τὸν μισθὸν τὸν ὀφειλόμενον.*[2] One must not expect too much of Justin, but for our purpose he has one advantage; he is admitted to go back ultimately to Ephorus. From Justin to Ephorus is a far cry, but even in Justin we can trace a coincidence, not only of fact, but of expression.

With regard to Polyaenus, by far the most exhaustive work on the sources of his *Strategemata* is the article

[1] I may here point out, in support of my argument, that the closeness of the correspondence between Diodorus and P. so much impressed the Editors, that they ventured to call in question the received theory that Ephorus was the source of Diodorus. They expressed the opinion that this theory would have to be reconsidered. I mention this, of course, merely in order to show how much the Editors themselves were impressed by these startling coincidences between Diodorus and P.

[2] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xv. 1.

by Melber in the *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* (Fleckeisen's), Supplement-Band xiv (1885), pp. 417–688. There has been nothing of any importance written since its publication, and it has come to be treated (e.g. by Busolt) as the authoritative work on the subject. The conclusion at which he arrives is that the greater part of Book I, the most valuable book, by far, of Polyaenus' work, is derived from Ephorus, and that almost all that is valuable in Books II and III is also derived from him. In other words, Ephorus is the principal authority followed by Polyaenus down to the year 356 B.C. The other books, with the exception of certain parts of Book VII, being concerned with a period later than this date, do not come into the reckoning. He thinks that Polyaenus supplemented his extracts from Ephorus by a few extracts from Herodotus and Thucydides, but that in no case did he use Xenophon. He is disposed, somewhat hesitatingly, to assign to Theopompus' *Hellenica* one set of passages, and one only; that is, those that deal with Clearchus, the Spartan, near the beginning of Book II,[1] all of which belong to a single year, 402/1. They do not come from Xenophon, and he thinks they did not come from Ephorus; therefore, he argues, they came, probably, from Theopompus. But with that exception, so far as I have been able to discover, there is not a single passage in Polyaenus which he assigns to Theopompus; whereas he assigns to Ephorus the greater part, five-sixths at least, of all that has any historical value in the period covered by him. If Melber's conclusions are correct (and there has been general agreement hitherto that they are correct), it follows that there is

[1] II. 2. 6–10.

a very high degree of probability that any given passage of Polyaenus during this period of the history will be found to come from Ephorus. Meyer, of course, assumes —he is bound to assume—that the sections which exhibit correspondences with P. were derived from Theopompus, but it is an assumption that no one made before the discovery of P., and it is a pure assumption. There is not a scrap of evidence in its favour, other than the coincidence between Polyaenus and P.

The first passage which I select is from Book I,[1] and it is a passage of extreme interest. One of the most startling discrepancies between P. and Xenophon, as well as all other authorities, is to be found in the attribution of the mission of Timocrates, not to Tithraustes, but to Pharnabazus, and in its being put, not only before the overthrow of Tissaphernes, but even before the appearance of Tithraustes on the scene.[2] The only passage in ancient literature which agrees with this statement in P. is this passage in Polyaenus :

Κόνων Φαρναβάζῳ συμμαχῶν Ἀγησιλάου τὴν Ἀσίαν πορθοῦντος ἔπεισε τὸν Πέρσην χρυσίον πέμψαι τοῖς δημαγωγοῖς τῶν πόλεων τῆς Ἑλλάδος, οἳ λαβόντες πείσουσι τὰς πατρίδας ἐκφέρειν τὸν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους πόλεμον. οἱ μὲν δεκασθέντες ἔπεισαν, καὶ συνέστη πόλεμος Κορινθιακός· οἱ δὲ Σπαρτιᾶται τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀνεκαλέσαντο.

This, it must be remembered, is a passage which is ascribed, and unhesitatingly ascribed, by Melber to Ephorus.

[1] Polyaen. I. 48. 3.

[2] This is a certain inference from ii. 2, when compared with ii. 5 ; for (1) the sending of the Persian gold to Greece is mentioned before the overthrow of Tissaphernes is narrated ; (2) the sending of the gold had clearly been described in P. before the commencement of our fragment ; and (3) Pharnabazus is mentioned in a way which implies that it was he who sent the gold.

The second passage[1] relates to the plot against Tissaphernes. It is as follows:

Ἀρταξέρξης ἐπὶ τὴν Τισαφέρνους σύλληψιν κατέπεμψε Τιθραύστην δύο ἐπιστολὰς κομίζοντα, τὴν μὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐπιτρέπων αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τὴν δὲ πρὸς Ἀριαῖον, ὅπως αὐτὸν συλλάβοι μετὰ Τιθραύστου. Ἀριαῖος ἀναγνοὺς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κολοσσαῖς τῆς Φρυγίας καλεῖ Τισαφέρνην ὡς ὁμοῦ βουλεύσασθαι δέον τά τε ἄλλα καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. ὁ δὲ μηδὲν ὑπιδόμενος τὸ μὲν στρατόπεδον κατέλιπεν ἐν Σάρδεσιν, αὐτὸς δὲ μετὰ τριακοσίων λογάδων Ἀρκάδων καὶ Μιλησίων ἀφικόμενος ἐν Ἀριαίου κατέλυεν· ἤδη δὲ περὶ λουτρὸν ἔχων τὸν ἀκινάκην ἀπέθετο. Ἀριαῖος μετὰ τῶν θεραπευτήρων συναρπάσας αὐτόν, καθείρξας εἰς ἁρμάμαξαν κατερραμμένην ἄγειν Τιθραύστῃ παρέδωκεν. ὁ δὲ μέχρι μὲν Κελαινῶν ἐγκατερραμμένον ἤγαγεν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἀποτεμὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεκόμισε βασιλεῖ. βασιλεὺς δὲ ἔπεμψε τῇ μητρὶ Παρυσάτιδι, ᾗ μάλιστα ἐσπουδάκει τίσασθαι Τισαφέρνην ἐπὶ τῇ Κύρου τελευτῇ.

The account, it will be seen, is fuller than the account in Diodorus, with the result that the coincidences between Polyaenus and P. are even more striking than those between Diodorus and P. If you read through the account in Polyaenus side by side with the fragmentary lines of P., you will see that these fragments suggest that we should find the closest possible correspondence between the two narratives, if P. were intact. Book VII, from which this passage comes, deals with *στρατηγήματα τῶν βαρβάρων*. Melber had a theory as to this book which the coincidence between P. and this passage proves to be erroneous. He thought that this passage, in common with a great number of other passages in this book, was derived from an author who wrote at least a century later than Ephorus. He is not, however, very confident about his hypothesis, and, as a matter of fact, he

[1] Polyaen. VII. 16. 1. Cf. Diod. XIV. 80. 6–8, and P. viii. 1, 2 (col. vii, viii).

is disposed to attribute to Ephorus a *στρατήγημα* which occurs a page or two beyond this particular one, and relates to the same period. The hypothesis is clearly incorrect; it is quite clear that Polyaenus either followed Ephorus for this period in Book VII, as he followed him elsewhere, or else followed P., whoever P. was, if he were not Ephorus.

The third passage[1] which I propose to discuss is one in which the closest possible coincidence can be traced, not indeed between Polyaenus and P., but between Polyaenus and Diodorus. It relates to the dispatch of Herippidas to Heraclea, in the year 399. The passage is of great importance, because it relates to an event which must have been narrated in Book XVIII of Ephorus, the very book we are concerned with.[2] As the account in Polyaenus occupies no more than seven lines, and in Diodorus no more than six, you must not expect too much. What degree of coincidence do we find? Here are the parallel accounts.

Polyaenus II. 21.

Ἡριππίδας **ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἡράκλειαν τὴν Τραχινίαν, συναγαγὼν ἐκκλησίαν, περιστήσας τοὺς ὁπλίτας** *ἐκήρυξε τοὺς Τραχινίους καθίσαι χωρίς. οἱ μὲν ἐκάθισαν· ὁ δὲ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτούς,* **περὶ ὧν ἀδικοῦσι,** *Λακεδαιμονίοις κρίσιν ὑποσχεῖν, ὡς νόμιμόν ἐστιν ἐν τῇ Σπαρτιάτιδι, δεθέντας. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ὁπλιτῶν δεθέντες ἔξω πυλῶν ἤχθησαν,* **καὶ** *δὴ* **πάντες ἀνῃρέθησαν.**

Diodorus XIV. 38. 4.

Ἐν Ἡρακλείᾳ *δὲ* **τῇ περὶ Τραχῖνα** *στάσεως γενομένης, Ἡριππίδαν ἐξέπεμψαν Λακεδαιμόνιοι καταστήσοντα τὰ πράγματα.* **Ὃς παραγενόμενος εἰς Ἡράκλειαν, συνήγαγεν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν** *τὰ πλήθη,* **καὶ περιστήσας** **ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις,** *συνέλαβε* **τοὺς αἰτίους,** *καὶ* **πάντας ἀνεῖλεν,** *ὄντας περὶ πεντακοσίους.*

[1] Polyaen. II. 21; Diod. XIV. 38. 4.

[2] It is narrated by Diodorus immediately after the campaign of Thibron.

I can hardly conceive of a correspondence that could be closer.[1] It is quite clear that here, as in the other two passages, we are compelled to choose between two alternative hypotheses. One hypothesis is simplicity itself. The correspondence between Diodorus and P. is explained by the fact that Diodorus was excerpting Ephorus, and Ephorus is P.; the correspondence between Diodorus and Polyaenus is to be explained by the fact that both were following one and the same authority, and that authority was Ephorus; and the correspondence between Polyaenus and P. is to be explained by the fact that Polyaenus was, at one and the same time, excerpting Ephorus and P. What is the other alternative? To assume that both Ephorus and Polyaenus excerpted P., P. being Theopompus, or anybody else you please; that they not only selected the same incidents, but that they preserved precisely the same phrases; and the work was done so mechanically that even in Diodorus, at third hand, the very phrases used by P. can clearly be detected.

Was this, as a matter of fact, the way in which Ephorus worked? That is a question which, I think, can be answered by turning to certain passages in Book VIII of Thucydides, and to the corresponding narratives in Diodorus. Schwartz has maintained that Ephorus' work may be divided into two clearly defined parts: the first part in which he was following Thucydides (and, of course, Herodotus before him), and following him very closely; and the second part which begins where Thucy-

[1] I must confess that the grave discrepancies which Meyer detects appear to me to be quite imaginary: e.g. *οἱ Τραχίνιοι* in the one, a *στάσις* among the *Τραχίνιοι* in the other. The excessively compressed character of both versions must be taken into account.

dides ends. In regard to this second part, Schwartz, writing in 1907, a year before the Papyrus was published, says, 'It is wholly inconceivable that Ephorus could have followed any other authority for this later period, either to the same extent, or in the same manner, as he followed Thucydides for the earlier period.' With that verdict I have no quarrel; where I venture to differ from him is as to the point at which we are to draw the line. The real line of division occurs, not at the end of Book VIII of Thucydides, as he assumes, but at the end of Book VII. This is a conclusion which follows from a comparison of two passages in Diodorus and Thucydides. The passages which we can compare relate to the battle of Oropus, just before the fall of the Four Hundred, and the battle of Cynossema.[1] In Diodorus' account of the battle of Oropus (it is a very brief account; only two or three lines) what is insisted upon is the dissension between the two Athenian commanders. Of that there is nothing in Thucydides; and necessarily so, because he mentions only one commander. Clearly then the account in Ephorus was widely different from the account in Thucydides. In regard to the battle of Cynossema, we must distinguish between the antecedents and consequents of the battle and the battle itself. The antecedents and consequents present a general resemblance to the narrative of Thucydides, except that in the antecedents there are some serious discrepancies from Thucydides. Not only is the part played by Tissaphernes in Thucydides attributed to Pharnabazus (that is common to all this part of Diodorus' narrative [2]), but in Diodorus there is

[1] Thucyd. VIII. 95; cf. Diod. XIII. 36. 3, 4. Thucyd. VIII. 103–5; cf. Diod. XIII. 39, 40.

[2] The blunder may be Diodorus' own.

mention of a squadron dispatched to Rhodes under Dorieus about which Thucydides says nothing, and the positions assigned to the divisions of Thrasyllus and Thrasybulus are reversed. In the account of the battle itself, however, there is no resemblance between the version of Diodorus and the version of Thucydides. The central feature in Diodorus' narrative is the current between Sestos and Abydos; in Thucydides, it is the promontory of Cynossema. In Diodorus, all turns upon the skill of the Athenian κυβερνῆται, and the victory is determined by the sudden appearance round a headland of an Athenian reinforcement of twenty-five vessels. Thucydides knows nothing of this reinforcement, or of the skill of the Athenian κυβερνῆται. He attributes the victory to the disorganization of the Peloponnesian fleet, the result of their initial success. Thus we see that, even in a period that falls within the compass of Thucydides' work, Ephorus departed entirely from the version of his main authority in his description of the only two battles by which we can judge him; the only two, that is, which are narrated by Diodorus between the Sicilian expedition and the point at which Thucydides breaks off. Yet we are asked to believe that, when Ephorus is following, not the master Thucydides, but the hypothetical disciple Theopompus, and when he is describing military operations, he followed the disciple so servilely, and so mechanically, that the very expressions used by Theopompus can still be detected in the meagre epitome of Diodorus! And here we cannot fall back on the hypothesis that Ephorus is dependent on Theopompus. The latter's starting-point excludes Cynossema, as well as Oropus, from his *Hellenica*. The evidence of Diodorus on this

point is, it is true, contradictory. On the one hand,[1] he states that Xenophon and Theopompus began where Thucydides left off (Ξενοφῶν δὲ καὶ Θεόπομπος ἀφ' ὧν ἀπέλιπε Θουκυδίδης τὴν ἀρχὴν πεποίηνται)—a statement which is absolutely accurate as regards the *Hellenics* of Xenophon; on the other,[2] he gives the battle of Cynossema as the point at which Theopompus' narrative commenced: ὁ δὲ συγγραφεὺς οὗτος ἦρκται μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς περὶ Κυνὸς σῆμα ναυμαχίας, εἰς ἣν Θουκυδίδης κατέληξε τὴν πραγματείαν. The key is supplied by the anonymous author of a life of Thucydides,[3] who tells us that Thucydides stopped at the battle of Cynossema, and left it to Xenophon and Theopompus to narrate the rest of the War: τὰ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ἑτέροις γράφειν κατέλιπε, Ξενοφῶντι καὶ Θεοπόμπῳ· εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ αἱ ἐφεξῆς μάχαι· οὔτε γὰρ τὴν δευτέραν ναυμαχίαν τὴν περὶ Κυνὸς σῆμα, ἣν Θεόπομπος εἶπεν, οὔτε τὴν περὶ Κύζικον . . . , οὔτε τὴν ἐν Ἀργινούσαις ναυμαχίαν . . . οὔτε . . . τὴν ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς ναυμαχίαν. The battle of Cynossema which formed Theopompus' starting-point was not the battle described by Thucydides; it was a second battle of Cynossema. This second battle can only be the engagement (or rather, engagements), narrated in the barest outline at the beginning of Xenophon's *Hellenics,* which we are accustomed to call the battle of Abydos. The promontory of Cynossema may well have played a part in a series of operations which extended from Sestos and Abydos to Madytus and Rhoeteum. That it played an important part in Theopompus' version is clear; it is equally clear that it played no part in that of Ephorus.[4] Yet Ephorus' version of Abydos

[1] XIII. 42. 5.
[2] XIV. 84. 7.
[3] Anonymus, *Vita Thucydid.* 5 (=Theopompus, fr. 6 (*d*), G. and H.).
[4] Diodorus XIII. 45, 46.

diverges from Xenophon's as widely as his version of Cynossema from that of Thucydides. A conclusion follows which is of first-class importance in its bearing on the general question of the relation of Ephorus to Theopompus. Ephorus, at any rate in his narrative of battles, is capable of producing a version which differs completely from that given by Thucydides or Xenophon, and yet is entirely independent of any material supplied by Theopompus. His source may have been the inner consciousness; it was not the inner consciousness of Theopompus. Ephorus was not the intermediary between Theopompus and Diodorus.

Of the other arguments in favour of Ephorus, I propose to discuss first the argument from style. This is an argument which need not detain us long, not because it is unimportant (on the contrary, its force is almost overwhelming, when once the initial obstacles to the identification of Ephorus with P. have been cleared away), but because it is unnecessary to say much about it, since its force would be admitted by all. Schwartz, in his article in *Hermes*,[1] admits that the style of P. is so unlike all that he had imagined the style of Theopompus to be, that he was compelled to hesitate for a long while, before he could accept the identification of P. with Theopompus. But the style of P. is precisely what we all imagined the style of Ephorus would be, were he ever recovered. Schwartz,[2] writing in 1907, the year before the publication of the Papyrus, insists on 'der monotone Fluss seiner Erzählung'; a verdict on Ephorus which recalls the verdict passed by the Editors on P.: 'the monotonous style of the author

[1] '*Die Zeit des Ephoros*,' *Hermes*, xliv (1909).

[2] In the article *Ephoros* in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*.

is seldom stirred to a little life.' Busolt,[1] writing years before the discovery of P., describes Ephorus as 'nüchtern, ohne Leidenschaft und wahre Phantasie'; while of his style he says, 'seine Sprache ist kraftlos und ohne Schwung,' and 'Mattigkeit' its characteristic. It is clear that the Editors would be prepared to accept these phrases as applicable to P., whose style they admit to be 'lifeless and verbose'. I myself have elsewhere ventured to say that dullness is the note of our author's style.[2] One or two special considerations may be advanced in support of this general position. *Ἀκραίφνιον*,[3] as an argument for Ephorus, may fairly be set against *Καρπασεύς*,[4] as an argument for Theopompus; for it may be inferred with certainty from Stephanus of Byzantium,[5] on the one hand, that Ephorus used the form *Ἀκραίφνιον* in place of the usual *Ἀκραίφιον*, and, on the other, that Theopompus used the plural form *τὰ Ἀκραίφνια*. The occurrence in P. of the Ephorean form is as decisive against the claims of Theopompus as any argument of this kind can be; if Theopompus habitually called the place *τὰ Ἀκραίφνια*, he cannot have written chapter xi of P. It is not, of course, decisive in favour of Ephorus, because the form *Ἀκραίφνιον* may have been employed by Cratippus or by other writers; it is, however, extremely strong evidence in his favour. Secondly, I would call attention to two phrases which occur in the description of the proceedings of Demaenetus, at the very beginning of the Papyrus. He is said to have acted *[οὐ μετὰ τῆς τοῦ] δήμου γνώμης*, and *κοινωσάμενο[ς ἐν] ἀπορρήτῳ τῇ βουλῇ*. The first phrase finds a parallel

[1] *Griechische Geschichte*, Bd. i, p. 157 (2nd ed.).
[2] *Klio*, viii.
[3] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xi. 3.
[4] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xv. 1.
[5] Ἀκραιφία, πόλις Βοιωτίας.

in two passages in Diodorus.[1] The first of these relates to the Athenian general Chabrias, who is said to have accepted the command of the Egyptian army *ἄνευ τῆς τοῦ δήμου γνώμης.* The second refers to Sphodrias, who is stated to have been persuaded by Cleombrotus to attempt his raid *ἄνευ τῆς γνώμης τῶν ἐφόρων.* To the second phrase there are also two parallels.[2] The first refers to the rebuilding of the walls of Athens; it is said of Themistocles that *ἐν ἀπορρήτοις τῇ βουλῇ προεῖπεν.* In the second passage the Athenians are represented as inviting Themistocles *ἐν ἀπορρήτοις εἰπεῖν τῇ βουλῇ τὰ δεδογμένα.* I should not insist so much on the actual verbal coincidences, which may doubtless be paralleled elsewhere, as on the combination of the verbal coincidence with the coincidence in the situation. It is clear, both that the situation described at the commencement of P. is the sort of situation that appealed to the mind of Ephorus, and that it is described in a phraseology that is characteristic of his style.

I pass to another argument in favour of the identification of P. with Ephorus, an argument based upon the interests which are indicated in P., and upon the special kind of knowledge disclosed in his narrative. There are three features which can hardly fail to strike us: the interest evinced in the affairs of Boeotia and Central Greece; the intimate knowledge of Asia Minor; and the equally intimate knowledge of the proceedings of Conon and his fleet. First, as to Boeotia and Central Greece. A hundred and forty lines, or one-fifth of the total, is given up to Boeotia and Phocis, and the account displays, or professes to display, an intimate knowledge,

[1] XV. 29. 2; XV. 29. 5. [2] XI. 39. 5; XI. 42. 5.

both of the politics of those states, and of the topography of the region.[1] Secondly, as to Asia Minor. Whether we regard the account of the second campaign of Agesilaus (in the autumn of 395) as authentic or not, no one can question either the fullness, or the excellence, of the topographical detail. And as to the third point, the intimate knowledge of the proceedings of Conon and his fleet, that is perhaps the most salient feature in the fragment. What is the bearing of all this upon the claims of Ephorus?

An interest in Boeotia has long been recognized as one of the characteristics of his work.[2] It is revealed both in direct quotations from Ephorus, and by passages in Diodorus; it may also be detected in additions which are found in Diodorus to the parallel narratives in Thucydides and Xenophon. One of the best examples is a very important passage in Book XI of Diodorus,[3] which treats of the reorganization of the Boeotian League by the Spartans, and of the battle of Tanagra. Diodorus devotes four or five chapters to events which occupy a few lines in Thucydides, and imparts in these chapters much important information. So too, in his account of the battle of Delium,[4] Diodorus, while closely following the narrative of Thucydides, makes two notable additions to it. The first is the mention of the *ἄνδρες ἐπίλεκτοι τριακόσιοι, οἱ ἡνίοχοι καὶ παραβάται καλούμενοι*, who fought in the front of the Boeotian line; and the second is a fairly full description of the use to which the Thebans put their share of the spoils. Again, in connexion

[1] Meyer (*Theopomps Hellenika*, p. 90) is clear that P. is following in his account of things Boeotian, 'eine sehr detaillirte lokale Quelle'.

[2] Cf. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, Bd. i, p. 158 (2nd ed.).

[3] XI. 79–83.

[4] XII. 69, 70.

with the account of the shipwreck of a Peloponnesian squadron of 50 vessels off Mount Athos in the year 411, Diodorus[1] quotes (from Ephorus, by name) an *ἐπίγραμμα* on an *ἀνάθημα*, which had been dedicated at the temple at Coronea by the twelve who alone survived out of the entire fleet. In this passage Ephorus' name is attested. Another instance may be found in the description in Diodorus[2] of the building of a bridge across the Euripus by the Boeotians in the year 410, after the revolt of Euboea, in order to connect Euboea with Boeotia. A comparison of the account in Diodorus with Fragment 67 of Ephorus (a very lengthy and important fragment which we owe to Strabo) attests Ephorus for this passage also. Once more, in his description of the unsuccessful attack of Agis upon Athens in the year 408,[3] Diodorus tells us that the Thebans sent 900 men to the aid of Agis, and he dwells on their ambition not to come short of the glories of Delium. Neither of these details is in the parallel account in Xenophon. Similarly, in his account of the battle of Arginusae, the part played by the Boeotians, on the Spartan left, is insisted on. This is not only not in Xenophon's account, but it is irreconcilable with it. Lastly, in the account of the rebuilding of the walls of Athens by Conon, it is stated that the Thebans sent 500 *τεχνῖται*[4] to aid in the work. These passages and many more might be adduced; I am taking only the most conspicuous examples. They prove to the hilt Ephorus' interest in things Boeotian.

It would be a great mistake, however, to infer from this that Ephorus was a blind partisan of the Theban

[1] XIII. 41. 3.
[2] XIII. 47. 3–5.
[3] XIII. 72. 3–9.
[4] XIV. 85. 3.

cause. The long passage quoted by Strabo,[1] which is so commonly adduced as proving the Boeotian sympathies of Ephorus, proves nothing of the kind. It proves his interest in the country, and his intimate knowledge of it; it proves also his enthusiasm for its hero; but it proves that his enthusiasm was centred, not on Thebes, but on Epaminondas. He blames the Thebans because the only *ἀρετή* for which they cared was military *ἀρετή*, and because they were indifferent to *παιδεία* and *λόγοι*; he asserts that their greatness was solely due to their great men, and that their hegemony passed away immediately on the death of Epaminondas.[2] Surely, a blind partisan of the Theban cause could, with a fair show of reason, have extended the Theban hegemony for some years after the battle of Mantinea. Again, in the passage in Book XI of Diodorus,[3] to which I have just referred, the general tenor of the narrative is more favourable to the Athenian cause than the account in Thucydides. If any bias is to be detected there, it is an anti-Boeotian bias.[4] No weight can, therefore, be attached to the argument advanced by Meyer, and by other supporters of the claims of Theopompus, that the account of the outbreak of the war between Thebes and Phocis in P.[5] cannot be from the pen of Ephorus, on the ground that it is less unfavourable to the Spartan cause than the parallel narrative in Xenophon. It is, of course, true that Xenophon represents the Spartans as eager for an

[1] Ephorus, Fragm. 67.

[2] *Τελευτήσαντος γὰρ ἐκείνου τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἀποβαλεῖν εὐθὺς τοὺς Θηβαίους.* A comparison with Diod. XV. 79. 2 (*εὐθέως καὶ τὰ τῶν Θηβαίων πράγματα τῇ τούτου τελευτῇ συναπέθανεν*) proves that the reference is to the period which immediately followed Mantinea.

[3] XI. 81–83. [4] e.g. 82. 1 and 4.

[5] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xiii. 4.

excuse to attack Thebes, whereas P.'s version is to the effect that, when the Phocians reported to the Spartans that the Thebans had espoused the cause of the Locrians, the Spartans at first did not believe the news, and contented themselves with inviting the Thebans to submit the question to arbitration; but the fact has no bearing on the question of authorship, unless we assume a Theban bias on the part of Ephorus which certainly cannot be proved.

The interest in the affairs of the minor states of Central Greece, which is so marked a feature in P., can be traced, not less evidently, in Ephorus. There are five references in Diodorus to Phocis and Locris in a period of less than forty years.[1] It is true that four of the five are to be found in Thucydides, but it is significant that where so much that is important in Thucydides is omitted in Diodorus, these references to facts which are far from important not only find a place in his narrative, but are described in greater detail. What is still more to the point is the special reference in two of these passages[2] to the region round Mount Parnassus. In both he is closely following Thucydides, but there is a touch in Diodorus which is wanting in Thucydides; that touch is the mention of Parnassus. The first passage relates to the Spartan expedition into Doris in the year 457, in order to champion the cause of the Dorians against the Phocians; the expedition that led ultimately to the battle of Tanagra. Diodorus there describes the Dorians as *οἰκοῦντας πόλεις τρεῖς . . . κειμένας ὑπὸ τὸν λόφον τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον Παρνασσόν*. In the other passage, after describing Myronides' reduction of Locris after the battle of Oenophyta, he adds *ἐνέβαλεν*

[1] Diod. XI. 79. 4; 83. 2; XII. 42. 4; 59. 2; 80. 4. The period is that from 457 to 418.

[2] XI. 79; XI. 83.

εἰς τὴν Παρνασίαν. One of the most striking passages in P. is the description[1] of the raids and reprisals carried on amongst the shepherds who pastured their flocks on the debatable territory (*ἀμφισβητήσιμος χώρα*) on the slopes of Mount Parnassus. The passage betrays unmistakably the author's interest in this region. But the case is strongest with regard to the Spartan colony of Heraclea. There are at least four mentions of the affairs of Heraclea in Diodorus,[2] and on the occasion of its foundation it is asserted to have been intended as a *μυρίανδρος πόλις*—an assertion which certainly derives no countenance from the narrative in Thucydides, and is improbable in itself. This interest shown by Ephorus in Heraclea affords a striking confirmation of the contention already advanced, that the passage in Polyaenus, relating to the intervention of Herippidas in the affairs of Heraclea, came from Ephorus, and not from Theopompus. It is extremely improbable that Theopompus should have displayed a similar interest in the affairs of so petty a town as Heraclea. In regard to Asia Minor, who would be more likely to possess an intimate knowledge of Western Asia Minor than Ephorus of Cyme? This is, perhaps, not an argument against Theopompus, for Theopompus was a native of Chios. For all that, the knowledge which we find in P. is just the kind of knowledge which we should expect to find in Ephorus. Lastly, with regard to Conon and the naval warfare, Meyer makes a significant admission. He concedes that in this part of the narrative, which is here so singularly full of detail, there is no hint or trace of the author's having availed himself of any Spartan 'source'; his information seems

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xiii. 3.

[2] Diod. XII. 59. 5; 77. 4; XIV. 38. 4; 82. 6.

to have come entirely from the Athenian side. That is not quite what we should expect from Theopompus—the bitter enemy of Athens, the panegyrist of Agesilaus. But it is precisely what we should expect in Ephorus. I see no reason to doubt the unanimous tradition of antiquity that Ephorus was the pupil of Isocrates, though Schwartz thinks it had its origin in the mere fact that Ephorus and Isocrates were so obviously kindred spirits. And if the tradition is true, the natural link between Ephorus and Conon would be found in Isocrates, the intimate friend of Conon's son, Timotheus. You need only turn to Oration XV, or to the letter to Timotheus, to find evidence of the interest which Isocrates displayed both in the father and the son. Thus the hypothesis which identifies Ephorus with P. explains what is one of the most striking features in the latter's narrative.

LECTURE IV

THE CASE AGAINST EPHORUS EXAMINED

In the last lecture I endeavoured to establish the case for Ephorus by the aid of three arguments: the argument from coincidence, the argument from style, and the argument from the similarity of the interests evinced, and of the knowledge shown, by the two authors. In the present lecture I propose to discuss some of the arguments that have been advanced against the identification of P. with Ephorus. The first arguments which I shall consider are those which have been advanced by Laqueur and by Niese; by Laqueur with regard both to the *προοίμια* of Ephorus and his date, and by Niese with regard to his date.

Laqueur's argument as to the *προοίμια* may be summarized as follows. We know from Diodorus[1] that Ephorus prefixed a *προοίμιον* to each book: Diodorus also prefixes a *προοίμιον* to each of his extant books. When, however, we turn to the *προοίμια* of Diodorus, we are at once struck with a marked difference among them. The first three[2] conform to a common type. Each of them consists of two parts; firstly, of a rather full recapitulation of the results arrived at in the previous book; secondly, of a very brief indication of the contents of the book which it serves to introduce. This form of *προοίμιον* is entirely in accordance with the practice of the age of Diodorus. In other historians of

[1] Diod. XVI. 76. 5; an excerpt from his *Dictionary of Dates*.
[2] Diod. I. 42; II. 1. 1–3; III. 1.

the period we either find no προοίμιον at all, as in Tacitus, or else we find a προοίμιον of this type, as in Josephus. When, however, we pass to Book IV, we find, from this book onwards, a προοίμιον of an entirely different type. It begins with a reflection of a general character; sometimes it is a moral reflection (as a rule, a singularly trite one); sometimes it is a generalization respecting historical method. This type of προοίμιον is not to be paralleled in any writer of the age of Diodorus; indeed, it is difficult to find a parallel to it in any extant writer. It is Laqueur's contention that the προοίμια of this latter type, the προοίμια from Book IV to Book XVI, are adapted (i.e. borrowed, in part) from the προοίμια of Ephorus. If this position could be established, we might conceivably hope to find in these προοίμια of Diodorus an indication, both of the method of Ephorus, and of the compass of each particular book.

His case is based on these pieces of evidence. Firstly, the change occurs exactly at the point at which Diodorus took Ephorus as his guide, i.e. the beginning of Book IV; the first three books deal with subjects which were not included in the scope of Ephorus' work. Secondly, an examination of the προοίμια of the four last books (XVII to XX), where *ex hypothesi* Diodorus could not have Ephorus as his guide, because Ephorus' work, on any theory, did not reach beyond the year 341,[1] reveals to us the desperate straits to which he was reduced when he had to compose for himself a προοίμιον of this type; in other words, when he was compelled to formulate some general proposition. Lastly, in most of the προοίμια—in all, that is, which do not deal with historical method—the subject is presented, not in its

[1] Book XVI ends with the death of Philip (336 B.C.).

historical aspect, but in its rhetorical aspect, under the categories of ψόγος or ἐπιτίμησις, and ἔπαινος. These categories are a commonplace of the school of Isocrates; and the link between Diodorus and Isocrates is clearly to be found in Ephorus.[1]

I think there can be no question that Laqueur has proved his case, in the sense that he has proved that that portion of a προοίμιον which contains a generalization of some sort or other is borrowed from Ephorus. There is, however, but one instance in Diodorus in which we have before us the whole of a προοίμιον of Ephorus; namely, the προοίμιον to Book XV. The difficulty that must occur to every one, when an attempt is made to apply Laqueur's hypothesis to any individual case, lies in the fact that a book of Diodorus never corresponds to a book of Ephorus. What Diodorus described in one book, Ephorus described in two or three; consequently, no one προοίμιον of Ephorus could fit precisely any one book of Diodorus, for the simple reason that there could not be the same subject-matter. In the προοίμιον to Book XV this difficulty was easily surmounted. The προοίμιον to that book must have been the προοίμιον to the book of Ephorus, probably Book XXII, in which he described the battle of Leuctra. Diodorus included both Leuctra and Mantinea in Book XV; but, by dragging in at the end a reference to Mantinea, he succeeds in making a προοίμιον which was intended for Leuctra only do duty for a book which includes both Leuctra and Mantinea. Elsewhere it is evident, at the first glance, that there is not only much in these προοίμια that Diodorus can have written, but much that Ephorus

[1] Cf. Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, 53–55, and 57, 58; and Diodorus XV. 1. 1–2.

cannot have written. Take the *προοίμιον* to Book XII of Diodorus; a book which covers the period from 450 to 416. The *προοίμιον* starts with a sufficiently trite moral reflection, on the *ἀνωμαλία* of human affairs—the changes and chances of this mortal life. That *ἀνωμαλία* is illustrated by the reverse of Xerxes and by the rise of Athens to greatness; not, perhaps, a peculiarly appropriate introduction to a book which begins after the greatest period of Athenian achievement. The moral is further enforced by examples from the history of the fifty years that elapsed between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars. Among the heroes of this period there is found Miltiades, and among the glories of this age there are reckoned the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. Similarly, in the *προοίμιον* to Book XIV, which is the one for which the next best case can be made out (the first two sections of chapter 1 may very well come from Ephorus), Diodorus illustrates his moral—that those who are in high places should avoid misdeeds, because it is impossible for their evil doing to pass unnoticed—by the examples of the Thirty Tyrants at Athens, the Spartan *ἀρχή* after the end of the Peloponnesian War, and the tyranny of Dionysius. Yet if anything is certain, it is this, that no book of Ephorus included at one and the same time the Thirty Tyrants, the Spartan *ἀρχή*, and the reign of Dionysius. With regard to the *προοίμια* of the other books,[1] the most that can be said is that a few fragments of Ephorus may be found embedded in the rubble of Diodorus. If we except Book XV, we cannot say, in the case of any one of the

[1] Laqueur regards the *προοίμιον* of Book XI as a forgery. In this he is certainly correct. The *προοίμιον* of Book XIII is a puzzle, for it is a polemic against *προοίμια*. I am not convinced by Laqueur's explanation.

προοίμια in Diodorus, to what it was a *προοίμιον* in Ephorus. It is consequently impossible either to argue from the *προοίμια* of Diodorus to the historical method of Ephorus, or to determine in what sense he wrote *κατὰ γένος*; still less is any certainty attainable as to the compass of any given book. One would have thought that it was quite certain that Ephorus must have described the Sicilian expedition in a single book, and that to that book he must have prefixed a suitable *προοίμιον*; but the book in Diodorus which opens with the history of the Sicilian expedition is the very book to which he has prefixed the *προοίμιον* which is a polemic against the use of *προοίμια*. Laqueur may have proved his case as to the Ephorean origin of the *προοίμια* in Diodorus, and he may have proved it up to the hilt; his arguments leave the question of authorship—of the identification of P. with Ephorus—unaffected.

We come now to the arguments against the identification of P. with Ephorus which are based upon the supposed date of the latter's work. It is, of course, evident that there is the closest possible connexion between the question of authorship and the question of date. The arguments which I advanced in my article in *Klio*, in support of the position that P. must have been composed before the year 356, have been accepted as conclusive in a good many quarters; and they have been reinforced by Judeich, who contends that the description which is given in P.[1] of the niggardly policy of Persia towards the Greek mercenaries was only true of the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon, since a new era in Persian policy opened with the accession of Ochus, the next king, in 358. Can we

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xiv. 2.

harmonize this date for P.[1] with any date that can reasonably be assigned for the composition of Ephorus' work?

It is maintained by Niese and Laqueur that Ephorus' work was not published until after the death of Alexander; a date which would clearly be fatal to any identification of P. with Ephorus. The arguments which they have advanced are partly direct, and partly indirect. The direct arguments are based upon two quotations from Ephorus, one of which appears to require a date later than the victories of Alexander, and the other a date later than his death. The first of these quotations comes from a passage in Tertullian,[2] in which Ephorus is given as the authority for a dream of Philip's, before the birth of Alexander, which foretold the future greatness of his son.[3] The dream is obviously a *vaticinium post eventum*, and the story could not have originated until Alexander had become famous. The second piece of direct evidence is found in a passage in Clement of Alexandria,[4] in which it is stated that the interval between the Return of the Heraclidae and Alexander's crossing into Asia was given by Ephorus as 735 years. Quite clearly, this statement of Ephorus must have occurred at the beginning of his work, his starting-point being the Return of the Heraclidae, and Alexander's crossing into Asia could not have been generally recognized as an

[1] Meyer, it need hardly be remarked, does not admit the force of my argument. He puts the composition of P. between 356 and 346.

[2] *de Anima*, 46; Müller's *F. H. G.*, vol. iv, p. 642, Addenda to Ephorus, 150 (*a*).

[3] The dream is also referred to in Plutarch. Plutarch, *Alexander*, ch. 2.

[4] Clemens Alexan., *Stromateis*, I. 21; p. 403 of Potter's edition.

historical era until after his death. Hence it seems inevitably to follow that even the earliest books of Ephorus were not published until after Alexander's death.

These passages, however, are not nearly so conclusive as they may appear at first sight. The dream to which Tertullian refers must have been recorded in Book XXX, if Schwartz's view of its contents, which will presently be discussed, is correct[1]; i.e. in Demophilus' continuation of his father's work. Hence it has no bearing on the date of Ephorus' work. The passage in Clement of Alexandria is not free from difficulty. His actual statement is that the interval between the Return of the Heraclidae and Alexander's crossing into Asia, in the archonship of Epaenetus (335/4), is differently given by five different historians, whom he enumerates—Phanias, Ephorus, Timaeus, Clitarchus, Eratosthenes.[2] That all five of these historians should have reckoned the Return of the Heraclidae from one and the same era, the *διάβασις* of Alexander, is not very probable; it certainly looks as if, at any rate in the case of some of them, the interval had been reckoned from some other era, and as if the figures given by Clement were the result of calculation. However that may be, the figure given by Clement as Ephorus' reckoning is irreconcilable with the figure which Diodorus found in his chronological authority, who stated that Ephorus, start-

[1] Alexander was born in the autumn of 356 (Arrian, *Anabasis*, VII. 28. 1); i.e. in the Attic year 356/5. According to Schwartz, Book XXIX, the last from Ephorus' own hand, ended with the year 357/6.

[2] *ἀπὸ τούτου* (i.e. the Return of the Heraclidae) *ἐπὶ Εὐαίνετον ἄρχοντα, ἐφ' οὗ φασιν Ἀλέξανδρον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν διαβῆναι, ὡς μὲν Φανίας, ἔτη ἑπτακόσια δεκάπεντε, ὡς δὲ Ἔφορος, ἑπτακόσια τριάκοντα πέντε, ὡς δὲ Τίμαιος καὶ Κλείταρχος, ὀκτακόσια εἴκοσι, ὡς δὲ Ἐρατοσθένης, ἑπτακόσια ἑβδομήκοντα τέσσαρα.*

ing from the Return of the Heraclidae, included in his work about 750 years, down to the siege of Perinthus (341/40).[1] If this statement, therefore, is correct, Ephorus should have reckoned 756 years, and not 735, from the Return of the Heraclidae to Alexander's *διάβασις*. Clement may be a good authority, but Diodorus' chronological source is a still better one. The statements which Diodorus derives from it can be shown to be correct in the great majority of instances; in particular, the statements about historians and the compass of their works are invariably correct. At any rate, we are at liberty for the moment to presume that the statement in Diodorus is as likely to be correct as the statement in Clement. And it will presently be seen that the statement in Diodorus is certainly correct, and that consequently the statement in Clement is certainly incorrect.

The indirect arguments are connected with one of the most famous problems of Greek historiography, the problem of harmonizing two statements in Book XVI of Diodorus,[2] both of which are derived from his chronological authority. In the first passage it is stated that Demophilus, the son of Ephorus, composed a history of the Sacred War, which had been omitted by his father, and that he took as his starting-point the seizure of the temple at Delphi by Philomelus:

> Τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων Δημόφιλος μὲν ὁ Ἐφόρου τοῦ ἱστοριογράφου υἱὸς τὸν παραλειφθέντα πόλεμον ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ὀνομασθέντα δὲ ἱερόν, συντεταγμένος ἐντεῦθεν ἦρκται ἀπὸ τῆς καταλήψεως τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς συλήσεως τοῦ μαντείου ὑπὸ Φιλομήλου τοῦ Φωκέως· ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ πόλεμος

[1] Diod. XVI. 76. 5 χρόνον δὲ περιέλαβε ἐτῶν σχεδὸν ἑπτακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα.

[2] Diod. XVI. 14. 3; XVI. 76. 5.

οὗτος ἔτη ἕνδεκα, ἕως τῆς φθορᾶς τῶν διανειμαμένων τὰ ἱερὰ χρήματα.

In the second passage, under the year 341/40, the archonship of Nicomachus, he states that Ephorus brought down his history to the siege of Perinthus; that it consisted of thirty books, and covered a period of 750 years, reckoned from the Return of the Heraclidae:

Τῶν δὲ συγγραφέων Ἔφορος μὲν ὁ Κυμαῖος τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνθάδε κατέστροφεν εἰς τὴν Περίνθου πολιορκίαν· περιείληφε δὲ τῇ γραφῇ πράξεις τάς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν καθόδου. χρόνον δὲ περιέλαβε σχεδὸν ἐτῶν ἑπτακοσίων καὶ πεντήκοντα, καὶ βίβλους γέγραφε τριάκοντα, προοίμιον ἑκάστῃ προθείς.

A passage in Athenaeus [1] renders it certain that the work of Demophilus was reckoned as the thirtieth book of Ephorus; i. e. that twenty-nine books only were from the pen of Ephorus himself. Two explanations, and two only, are possible. The first is that Ephorus carried his work down to the siege of Perinthus, in 341/40, but that he had omitted the Sacred War from his narrative, and the omission was supplied by his son Demophilus. This is the explanation given by Niese and Laqueur.[2] The other explanation, that given by Schwartz, is that Ephorus carried his narrative down to the seizure of the Delphic temple by Philomelus in the year 357/6, and that Demophilus' thirtieth book was a continuation of Ephorus' work, from the outbreak of the Sacred War to the siege of Perinthus.

[1] Athenaeus, VI. 232 D (= Ephorus, Fragm. 155) Ἔφορος ἢ Δημόφιλος ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ τριακοστῇ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν περὶ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱεροῦ λέγων φησίν.

[2] Busolt's view is substantially the same: *Griech. Gesch.* Bd. i, pp. 155–6 (2nd ed.).

Laqueur[1] bases his case upon the following arguments. Firstly, Diodorus' words clearly imply that Demophilus' work was confined to a history of the Sacred War; τὸν παραλειφθέντα πόλεμον implies an omission, not a continuation, and the omission which he supplied was the narrative of the War. Secondly, the supplementary clause in the passage in Diodorus—ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος ἔτη ἕνδεκα—can only come from his chronological source, and must therefore indicate the range of Demophilus' work, which is thus proved to have been restricted to the eleven years from 357 to 346. Thirdly, all the extant fragments of Book XXX refer to the Sacred War. Lastly, it is impossible to suppose that the events of sixteen years can have been crammed into a single book.

Before we can estimate the value of these arguments, it is necessary to turn aside to another problem—of all the problems presented by the work of Diodorus perhaps the strangest. It has long been observed that in Diodorus' narrative of the outbreak of the Sacred War[2] the early stages of the war are told in duplicate. If we compare chapters 23 to 27 with chapters 28 and 29, we see at a glance that, although Diodorus narrates the events as consecutive, they are, in reality, not consecutive but synchronous. In other words, the two narratives are parallel narratives of the same incidents, though Diodorus himself is entirely unaware of the fact. In both versions we have the same account of the origin of the dispute—the fine imposed on the Spartans, at the instance of the Thebans, for the seizure of the Cadmea, and the fine subsequently imposed on the Phocians for the cultivation of some sacred land;

[1] Laqueur has argued the question more fully than Niese.

[2] Diod. XVI. 23–31.

in both we are told of the measures taken by Philomelus to repel the anticipated invasion of Phocis—the enrolment of troops, and the confiscation of the property of his opponents; in both, the invasion of Delphi by the Locrians and their defeat by Philomelus are narrated, and in both, again, the invasion of Locris by the Phocians and the devastation of the country; and, lastly, both versions describe the *στάσις* in the Amphictyonic League, where the majority sided with the Thebans against the Phocians, while the minority, consisting of Athens, Sparta, and certain of the Peloponnesian states, took the Phocian side. These incidents are common to both accounts, but they are narrated in a different order, and, in some respects, in a different form. The origin of the dispute, for instance—the fines imposed on the Spartans and the Phocians—is told in the earlier section at the beginning of the story, as an introduction to it; in the later section it is told at the end, by way of an addition. Similarly, the secret support promised by Archidamus and the Spartans is described much more fully and accurately in the first version than in the second. In the first version, again, the name of the Thracidae is given in connexion with the confiscations; in the second version it is merely stated that the goods of the wealthiest of the Delphians were confiscated (*τοὺς δὲ Δελφοὺς εὐδαιμονίᾳ καὶ πλούτῳ διαφέροντας ἐπράξατο πλῆθος χρημάτων*); while, *per contra*, in the second version the Phaedriad Rocks are named as the scene of the victory over the Locrians, it being merely stated in the first version that the battle was in the neighbourhood of Delphi. Lastly, there are two different accounts of the punishment which was meted out to the Phocian troops as being *ἱερόσυλοι*. The accounts contained in the two sections, therefore,

are two independent accounts. Only one explanation has ever been offered of this phenomenon. It is that at this point, the end of chapter 27, Diodorus laid aside the authority which he had hitherto followed, and turned to a new one. As that authority was Ephorus, it means that at this point he laid aside Ephorus; and the only satisfactory reason that can be suggested for this is that Ephorus failed him at this precise point; i. e. that this was the point at which Ephorus' narrative stopped. The hypothesis can be proved to be so far true, in that it can be demonstrated that Diodorus did not follow Demophilus' thirtieth book for the rest of the Sacred War. This is proved quite conclusively by a comparison of a fragment of this book, to which reference has already been made, with the parallel passage in Diodorus.[1] The passages relate to the retribution that is alleged to have overtaken all who had part or lot in the plunder of the Delphic temple. In both versions the retribution is extended to the wives of the Phocian generals, who had been guilty of decorating their persons with some of the most sacred offerings at Delphi, such as the necklaces of Helen and Eriphyle. In the sober narrative of Demophilus we read nothing worse than that the wife of one eloped with an Epirote youth, and that the other plotted her husband's death. In the version followed by Diodorus a more lurid vengeance is reserved for these offenders. The wife of one descended to the streets (*εἰς ἑταιρικὴν αἰσχύνην ἐνέπεσεν*), while the son of the other went mad and set fire to the family home,

[1] Ephorus, Fragm. 155; Diod. XVI. 64. 2. Among the many incredible things to be found in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, not the least incredible is his note at the end of this fragment, 'Eadem fere leguntur apud Diodor. XVI. 64.'

in the flames of which he and his mother perished. It is certain, therefore, that Diodorus did not make use of the thirtieth book of Demophilus.

When we turn from Diodorus' narrative of the Sacred War to his narrative of Sicilian history in the same book, we are presented with a problem almost as surprising. Diodorus has narrated the expedition of Dion in the earlier chapters of Book XVI, at considerable length and with much detail; and he has brought the story down to Dion's victory over the mercenaries, his reconciliation with the Syracusans, and his election as *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*. At this point the story of Dion's career breaks off, and the narrative of Sicilian affairs is not resumed until the expedition of Timoleon.[1] Here, again, the explanation suggests itself, that Diodorus turned in his Sicilian history from the authority he was following to a fresh authority, and failed to find his place in Sicilian history, as he failed to find his place in the Sacred War. In the case of the Sacred War, we started, it is true, with the assumption that the authority which he had been following was Ephorus; in the case of Dion, we cannot assume this without proof, because, although Diodorus appears to have followed Ephorus for the Sicilian history in the book immediately preceding this (Book XV), he follows, as a rule, Timaeus, rather than Ephorus, when he is treating of Sicily. However, if it may not be assumed, it can be proved. If we compare the passage in Plutarch's *Life of Dion* in which he describes the death of the historian Philistus with the parallel narrative in Diodorus, we shall find incontrovertible evidence that Ephorus was the authority which Diodorus

[1] There are two passing references from the chronological source, but nothing from the main authority.

followed in his account of Dion's expedition.[1] Plutarch tells us that according to Timonides of Leucas, the companion of Dion and the author of the memoirs from which Plutarch's narrative is mainly derived, Philistus was captured alive, and that Timaeus added that he was dragged by the heels through the streets by an infuriated mob; but that according to Ephorus he committed suicide. As this latter tale is the version given by Diodorus, it is evident that Diodorus followed Ephorus, and not Timaeus, for the expedition of Dion.

As Schwartz has pointed out, the connecting link between Diodorus' duplication of the initial stages of the Sacred War and the strange break in his narrative of Dion is to be discovered in the date. Of the date of Dion's election to the *στρατηγία* there is no manner of doubt. We know from Timonides[2] that the expedition sailed on August 9, 357, when the moon was eclipsed. His election as *στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ* was a few month later, and therefore fell in the Attic year 357/6. That was also the date of the seizure of the temple by Philomelus.[3] Therefore the point of time at whic Diodorus turned from Ephorus to another authority for the Sacred War was precisely the point at which he laid aside Ephorus in his narrative of the

[1] Plut. *Dion*, 35; Diod. XVI. 16. 3.

[2] *Ap.* Plut. *Dion*, 24.

[3] 357/6, the archonship of Agathocles, is the date given by Diodorus' chronological authority (XVI. 14. 3), and by Pausanias (X. 2. 2). It follows also from the evidence of its contemporaries, Demosthenes and Aeschines. The latter gives the length of the War as 10 years, and it ended towards the close of the Attic year 347/6. Cf. Aeschines, *de Fals. Leg.* 131; *in Ctesiph.* 148; Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, ii. 152 (3rd ed.).

Sicilian history. Laqueur wholly fails to explain this coincidence.

Laqueur's hypothesis, therefore, fails to satisfy a condition which must be regarded as an essential condition of any adequate solution of the problem. But quite apart from this, his explanation involves some manifest difficulties. There is, first of all, the difficulty of conceiving a history of Philip's reign from which the Sacred War was omitted, especially in a writer who wrote *κατὰ γένος*. There is the further difficulty of finding room in any book, or books, of Ephorus for a history of Philip which extended over a space of sixteen years. For here the evidence of the fragments is satisfactory and complete. Book XXV brought the narrative down to the battle of Mantinea, in 362 ; Books XXVIII and XXIX gave the Sicilian history under Dionysius the Elder and Dionysius the Younger. This only leaves Books XXVI and XXVII free. Laqueur admits that Book XXVI is wanted for the affairs of Greece between 362 and 357—not too large an allowance. We have thus to get the whole of the reign of Philip down to the year 341, *minus* the Sacred War, into one book, Book XXVII. That is too much even for Laqueur. He is forced to fall back on the amazing hypothesis that the subject of Book XXVII was the history of the consolidation of Philip's power against the northern barbarians, down to the moment when he came into contact with Athens at the siege of Perinthus. And this from Ephorus! Ephorus, who, according to Laqueur, wrote, here as elsewhere, *κατὰ γένος*; Ephorus, who, also according to Laqueur, had prefixed to this very Book XXVII (if I understand his somewhat involved argument aright) the *προοίμιον* which we find at the beginning of Diodorus' Book XVI—a *προοίμιον* which

insists on the advantages accruing from narrating ἢ πόλεων ἢ βασιλέων πράξεις αὐτοτελεῖς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τοῦ τέλους, and points out the drawbacks attendant on a method which tempts one to present to one's readers ἡμιτελεῖς πράξεις. And this was the προοίμιον to a book which contained a history of Philip, from which most of what was most important in that reign was omitted, and which brought it down to a point at which there was no reason why the narrative should end—the siege of Perinthus! For it assuredly was not at the siege of Perinthus that Philip first came in contact with the power of Athens. What about her support of the pretender Argaeus, at the very beginning of his reign? And, above all, what about the question of Olynthus? Such a theory, I venture to think, need not detain us longer.

It follows, then, that Schwartz has made out a case of overwhelming strength; that there can be no real doubt that Ephorus brought down his narrative only to the year 357/6, that he was surprised by death in the midst of his labours, and that the material which he left behind was worked up by his son. This material sufficed for a fairly full account of the Sacred War; the remaining years must have been narrated in little more than outline. From this an important conclusion as to the method of Ephorus may be deduced. If Ephorus carried down his narrative to a point which corresponds to chapter 27 of Diodorus' Book XVI, it is quite clear that he did not write history κατὰ γένος in the sense in which Laqueur contends, because he had already advanced some way into the Sacred War when he broke off; that is to say, it is quite clear that Ephorus did not intend to reserve the Sacred War for separate treatment.

But why did Demophilus carry down his narrative to the siege of Perinthus—to that point, and no farther? That is a question which, as yet, nobody has succeeded in answering. I shall venture to put before you a solution of the problem.

Professor Lehmann-Haupt, assuming the correctness of Clement's statement that Ephorus reckoned 735 years from the Return of the Heraclidae to the *διάβασις* of Alexander, has argued that this period of 735 years must imply a reckoning by generations, in which a generation was regarded as the equivalent of 35 years.[1] 735 is $=21 \times 35$; but it cannot be divided either by 30 or by 33. He suggests that Ephorus had obtained this reckoning from Hecataeus. As he does not think that Ephorus survived Alexander's *διάβασις*, he is disposed to attribute to Demophilus the selection of that event as an era. It follows that the era from which Ephorus reckoned the Return of the Heraclidae must have been the year 369,[2] the year of Epaminondas' first invasion of the Peloponnese, and that he must have reckoned it twenty generations from the Return of the Heraclidae to this first invasion.

I need hardly point out that the hypothesis of a generation reckoned at 35 years is not a very probable one. There is no positive evidence of it in the case of Hecataeus, and no evidence whatever for it in the case of Ephorus, except this particular statement in Clement of Alexandria. But a generation of 30 years was one of the commonest of all computations.

[1] Gercke und Norden, *Einleitung*, iii, p. 92. Cf. *Klio*, iv (1904), p. 123.

[2] If we reckon back 35 years from 334, the date of Alexander's *διάβασις*, we arrive at 369, the year of Epaminondas' first invasion of the Peloponnese.

It has been already pointed out that Clement's figure, 735 years, has no claim to be preferred to the figure given by Diodorus' chronological source, 750 years. 750 will divide by 30 ; it is clearly the equivalent of 25 generations, according to the ordinary computation of a generation at 30 years. If you subtract 30 from 750, you will get 720 ; you will be taken back from the archonship of Nicomachus (341/40), in which the siege of Perinthus began, to the archonship of Phrasiclides (371/70), the year of Leuctra. To the historian who made his starting-point the Return of the Heraclidae and the foundation of the Spartan state, what era could be more appropriate than the year of Leuctra, which saw the fall of Spartan greatness? And what year could be so natural to the panegyrist of Epaminondas? Of all the eras that could be suggested between the end of the Peloponnesian War and the *διάβασις* of Alexander, none is so obvious as Leuctra. About the year of Leuctra there is no doubt. It is given by Diodorus,[1] by Pausanias,[2] and by Plutarch,[3] who gives the actual date, the fifth day of Hecatombaeon. About the date of the siege of Perinthus there is a little more difficulty.[4] Both in his general narrative and in a passage derived from his chronological source Diodorus places the siege of Perinthus in the archonship of Nicomachus, while he relates the siege of Byzantium and the formal declaration of war by Athens under his successor Theophrastus (340/39); in the latter case absolutely correctly, as is proved by the well-known fragment of

[1] Diod. XV. 51–56. [2] Pausanias VIII. 27. 8.

[3] Plutarch, *Agesilaus*, 28.

[4] There is, however, no doubt whatever about the thirtieth book of Ephorus ; it ended in the archonship of Nicomachus (341/40) Diod. XVI. 76. 5.

Philochorus.[1] Philochorus, however, puts the siege of Perinthus, as well as the siege of Byzantium, in the archonship of Theophrastus. This has long since been seen to be an error.[2] It looks as if Philochorus had confused the beginning of the siege of Perinthus with the declaration of war by Athens. Clinton argues, quite conclusively, I think, that Demophilus carried his narrative down to the commencement of the siege of Perinthus, and broke off there, precisely as Ephorus carried his narrative down to the outbreak of the Sacred War. Beloch[3] holds exactly the same view as to the date of the siege of Perinthus. He says there can be no question that it began in the early part of the summer of 340 (i. e. in the Attic year 341/40). The question then, to which no satisfactory answer has been forthcoming hitherto, has been answered; the problem is solved. Demophilus carried his narrative down to the siege of Perinthus, because Ephorus had been interrupted by death in the midst of the twenty-fifth generation from his starting-point, the Return of the Heraclidae. The task which Demophilus undertook was the completion of the narrative down to the end of that generation for nearly half of which his father had already told the tale.

If this explanation is correct, if the era chosen by Ephorus was the year 371, the year of Leuctra, we have here a striking confirmation of the view that Ephorus wrote soon after 356; at any rate, not much later than 350.[4] But if Ephorus was writing his twenty-ninth book soon after the year 350, it is quite certain that he

[1] Fragm. 135.

[2] e.g. by Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, ii. 160 (3rd ed.).

[3] *Griech. Gesch.*, Bd. ii, p. 551, note 3.

[4] It is the view of Schwartz among others.

must have written his eighteenth book before the year 356, which is exactly the date which I have postulated for P. And I cannot admit that Harpocration's reference to Datus stands in the way of this conclusion. Datus found a place in the fourth book of Ephorus; that is certain: and its change of name to Philippi, in 356, was mentioned by Ephorus; that too is certain: what is far from certain is that the change of name was mentioned in the fourth book. Diodorus[1] points to Book XXVII rather than to Book IV. But even if it could be proved that the change of name was mentioned in Book IV, does it follow that Book IV was composed after 356, and that Book XVIII must, in consequence, have been composed long after 356? There are references in the later books of Herodotus to incidents of the Peloponnesian War, but few would care to maintain that these references *prove* that these books were composed after 430. Different editors have held different views as to the date of their composition, but no editor, so far as I am aware, has contended that it is impossible, or even improbable, that these references should have been inserted by Herodotus, when he was 'touching up' his work with a view to publication. Such a suggestion may be false; it is not, in itself, improbable. What is probable in Herodotus is not improbable in Ephorus; nothing is more likely than that the allusion to Philippi should have been introduced long after the composition of the book in question. And after all, how much do we know, either as to the order in which the books were written, or as to the method of their publication? The later books may have been composed before the earlier, and the whole

[1] XVI. 8. 6.

work may have been published by Demophilus after his father's death. The former of these suppositions is not very probable, but the latter is extremely probable.

This conclusion has a most important bearing upon another problem, connected both with P. and with Ephorus; the question of their relation to the *Hellenics* of Xenophon. In P. there is not a single certain trace of the *Hellenics*. It has, indeed, been argued that the words[1] *καίτοι τινὲς λέγουσιν αἴτια γενέσθαι τὰ παρ' ἐκείνου* (i. e. Timocrates) *χρήματα τοῦ συστῆναι τούτους*, which occur towards the beginning of the Papyrus, contain a reference to Xenophon's statement that the war was caused by the gold brought by Timocrates. Meyer, however, admits that this is an erroneous interpretation of the passage, on the ground that Xenophon expressly exculpates the Athenians from the charge of taking the gold, whereas it is implied in P. that the Athenians were included among the recipients in the version to which he alludes. There is no other trace anywhere in P. of the *Hellenics* of Xenophon. How stands it with Ephorus?[2] Firstly, what is the evidence of the fragments? There is one fragment which has been alleged to contain decisive evidence of Ephorus' acquaintance with Xenophon's work. It is the fragment[3] explanatory of the nickname 'Sisyphus' applied to Dercylidas, which has been quoted in a previous lecture. I can hardly imagine a weaker argument. Dercylidas was engaged chiefly in the neighbourhood of Ephorus' native place, Cyme. Is it inconceivable that Ephorus,

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* ii. 2.

[2] In order to simplify the problem, I confine myself to Books III–VII of the *Hellenics*.

[3] Fragm. 130.

if he lived in the first half of the fourth century (he may well have been a boy at the time of Dercylidas' campaign), should have heard from the contemporaries of the campaign the explanation of the nickname given to the Spartan commander? Secondly, what can be inferred from Diodorus? Meyer maintains that Diodorus' narrative of the campaigns of Dercylidas[1] proves that Ephorus was there following Xenophon. The coincidence of the two narratives is of so general a character that I submit that no argument can be based upon it. And here I must appeal to Schwartz. No higher authority can be invoked than Schwartz's article on Ephorus, written, as it was, the year before the discovery of the Papyrus, when there was no possible controversial interest to serve. What is his verdict? He can find no definite trace anywhere of the *Hellenics*; he doubts if Ephorus used Xenophon's work even to determine subordinate points. 'Einen spezifisch xenophontischen Zug habe ich nicht finden können; ich bezweifle, dass er die Hellenika auch nur accessorisch herangezogen hat.'[2] But if P. wrote before 356, and if Ephorus wrote his eighteenth book before 356, the explanation is not far to seek, seeing that Xenophon's *Hellenics* were not published before that year. P. did not employ the *Hellenics* as an authority, and Ephorus did not employ the *Hellenics* as an authority, for one and the same reason—the simple reason that they were not available. The importance of this conclusion will be obvious when we come to consider the question of authority. At any rate we may dismiss from our minds the notion that P. departs from Xenophon because his

[1] Diod. XIV. 38. 7; 39. 4–6.

[2] Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. vi, p. 12.

main object, to use Busolt's phrase, is to 'go one better' (*übertrumpfen*).

Of the other arguments which have been advanced against the identification of the author of our fragment with Ephorus, one has already been discussed.[1] It is the argument which is based on the discrepancies between the account in P. of Agesilaus' advance on Sardis and the corresponding narrative in Diodorus. As I have already indicated, there is only one of these discrepancies which constitutes a serious objection to the identification with Ephorus. It must be admitted that the ravaging of Tissaphernes' *παράδεισος* is an important incident in Diodorus' version, and it must also be admitted that it is not easy to find room for it in the fragmentary columns of P. There remain, however, certain further objections which demand consideration.

We may take first the argument which is based on the occurrence in chapter xi of the Papyrus of a description of the constitution of Boeotia. If our fragment is part of the eighteenth book of Ephorus, why, it may be asked, did not Ephorus describe the constitution in an earlier part of his work? Why did he not describe it, for instance, either after the battle of Coronea, in 446, or at the time of the complicated negotiations between the Corinthians and the Boeotians, in the autumn of 421, which broke down on the question of the submission of the arrangements to the four *βουλαί* (*ταῖς τέσσαρσι βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιοτῶν*)?[2] This argument does not appear to be conclusive. In the first place, in a writer who is so discursive as P. it is dangerous to argue that he must have introduced any particular piece of information at any particular place; and such an

[1] In Lecture III. [2] Thuc. V. 38.

argument is peculiarly dangerous when applied to an ancient historian.[1] Secondly, we must remember the difference in the scale of Ephorus' narrative before and after the end of the Sicilian expedition. Thirdly, of course, the objection would disappear if we accept the theory that Ephorus' history of the fourth century was written first, and the earlier history, down to the year 411, was written later; i.e. that he began with contemporary history, and then conceived the idea of entering upon a universal history. I will not insist upon this, however, because I do not think that this theory can be proved.

A second objection is connected with the ἔτος ὄγδοον in chapter iv. It is argued that this year, whatever year it was, whether 403/2 or 402/1, must have marked an epoch for the author of this work; and not only must it have marked an epoch, but it must have also marked the beginning of a new section of his history. We are at liberty to assume this of the *Hellenica* of Theopompus, because the fragments are so few that we may assume almost anything; but we cannot assume it of Ephorus. A similar objection has been based on the commencement of the Papyrus, which has been held (e.g. by the Editors) to indicate that a new book, or a new part of the work, began where the Papyrus itself begins. Book X of Theopompus may conceivably have begun there, but Book XVIII of

[1] Thucydides is far from being a discursive writer; yet no one would have expected antecedently that a digression on Harmodius and Aristogiton would find a place in the story of the Sicilian expedition. We shall do well to remember the fallacious arguments which have been based on his silence as to the increase of the φόρος in 425. His omission to mention it in the history of that year is almost incomprehensible; but the solid fact is that he does omit it.

Ephorus cannot conceivably have done so. I cannot attach as much value as most critics attach to the objection which is based on the *ἔτος ὄγδοον*. The passage is so much mutilated that we cannot determine to what it refers; all that we can say is that the year 403/2 (or the year 402/1) is a most extraordinary moment to choose for one's era. The argument may be allowed to have some weight, as advanced by those who hold (as Mr. Underhill does) that P. began at the point from which the *ἔτος ὄγδοον* is reckoned; but it has very little force as advanced by those who identify P. with Theopompus, because they have to postulate, without the least shadow of evidence, that at that very year Theopompus made a great division of his work into two parts, and made a fresh start. In a sense, the argument from the beginning of the Papyrus is destructive of the argument from the *ἔτος ὄγδοον*. We may argue that a new book began at chapter iv, with the summer of the eighth year (*τοῦ [θ]έρους τῇ μὲν* [. . . . .] *ἔτος ὄγδοον*); or we may argue that a new book began at the beginning of section A of the Papyrus: we cannot argue both things at once. If a new book began at chapter iv, a new book did not begin at the beginning of section A; if it began at the beginning of section A, it did not begin at chapter iv. And, after all, what is the evidence that Ephorus' seventeenth book, the book that preceded the eighteenth, did not begin in 403/2, or in 402/1? It is invariably assumed that it began at the end of the Peloponnesian War, on the strength of the passage in Diodorus[1] in which it is stated that Ephorus narrated the death of Alcibiades in his seventeenth book. As the death of Alcibiades

[1] Diod. XIV. 11. 2.

occurred in 404/3, it is commonly inferred that Ephorus' seventeenth book must have begun before the end of that year, which would almost certainly imply that it began immediately after the end of the Peloponnesian War. A comparison, however, of this passage with the opening words in chapter 22 of the same book suggests that the death of Alcibiades was narrated as an episode in the story of the Ten Thousand.[1] Consequently, if it were essential, though I maintain it is not essential, to assume that Book XVII of Ephorus began in the year 403/2, this particular passage would not stand in the way of the assumption. The answer to the question where Book XVII began depends upon the answer to another question, that of the length of Ephorus' narrative of the march of the Ten Thousand.

Closely connected with the last argument is an objection which I can anticipate, though I am not aware that it has been formulated. It may be asked how we can assign to Book XIX of Ephorus a range of subject which would be consistent at once with the limits which have been assumed, and with the scale of treatment which has been postulated, for Book XVIII. If the latter book ended with the recall of Agesilaus, Book XIX must have started with the spring, or early summer, of 394; it must have included Nemea and Agesilaus' homeward march, as well as Coronea and Cnidus. The *terminus ad quem* is usually found in the Peace of Antalcidas, on the strength of two fragments, 138 and 136. From the former of these it

[1] Compare the words at the beginning of XIV. 22 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἀρταξέρξης καὶ πάλαι μὲν ἦν παρὰ Φαρναβάζου πεπυσμένος ὅτι κτλ. with the story of Alcibiades' death, and Pharnabazus' motives, as told in XIV. 11.

appears that the διοικισμός of Mantinea, which belongs to the period immediately following the Peace, found a place in Book XX; from the latter, that the στάσις between the citizens of Clazomenae and an exiled faction at Chyton, which is referred to in an inscription, the date of which is immediately anterior to the Peace, was narrated in Book XIX.[1] I am disposed to accept the Peace as the *terminus ad quem*, but not on the ground of the στάσις at Clazomenae. True, hostilities are going on in 387/6 between οἱ ἐπὶ Χυτῷ and the δῆμος of Clazomenae; but this is far from proving that the reference in Ephorus was to an incident in this particular year. Such feuds had a way of being protracted ones, as we may see from the instance of Megara and the exiles at Pegae.[2] If then the Peace is taken as the *terminus ad quem*, Book XIX must have included no less than eight years (394 to 387), as against the five, or a little more, that we have assumed for the previous book. Is it conceivable, it may be urged, that a work planned on the scale of P. can have comprised eight years in a single book? To this it may be answered that a comparison based on the mere number of years is apt to be misleading. What matters is, not the number of the years, but the importance of the events that occurred in them. Thucydides covers seven years in Book V; in Book II he covers only three. No doubt, some of the years included in this period were important ones; e.g. 394 and 393, and the Attic year

[1] For Chyton cf. Ephorus, Fragm. 136, Hicks and Hill, *Greek Inscriptions*, 96 (=Dittenberger, *Sylloge*², 73), Aristot. *Politics*, VIII. 3. 15. The inscription is dated in the archonship of Theodotus, 387/6.

[2] Cf. Thucyd. III. 68 (427); IV. 66 (424). The στάσις had lasted at least three years.

390/89; but many of the years appear to have been unimportant ones. Of the later years of the Corinthian War Professor Bury says, 'The military events of these years are not of great interest; our knowledge of them is meagre.'[1] If our knowledge is meagre, it is probably because there was little to be known; even a writer as discursive as P. may have found comparatively little to say. In Diodorus, if any inference can be drawn from this, the last two years of the War are a blank.

Another argument on which some stress has been laid is the alleged inconsistency between the bias and sympathies which have been usually assumed for Ephorus and those which are observable in P. Here, again, the most formidable of the alleged inconsistencies has been discussed, and disposed of, in an earlier lecture.[2] It is true that the fragments betray the interest of Ephorus in Boeotia, as well as his enthusiasm for Epaminondas; but it is also true that an interest in Boeotia is equally discernible in P. It is true, again, that P. is no blind partisan of Thebes, but it is not true that Ephorus is one either. To what has been already said as to the version in P. of the outbreak of the Boeotian War, I will only add that, whether Ephorus loved Thebes much or little, he loved a complicated situation still more. P.'s version differs from Xenophon, not only in being less unfavourable to Sparta, but also in assuming a less simple course of events.[3] Meyer has discovered another inconsistency between Ephorus and P. in their attitude towards Athens. Ephorus has hitherto been assumed to have been

[1] *History of Greece*, p. 549. [2] Lecture III.

[3] The complications introduced by Ephorus into the story of Themistocles' exile (Diod. XI. 54, 55) afford an interesting parallel.

friendly to Athens. The motives which P. ascribes to the statesmen of Athens[1]—*οἱ δ' ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐπιθυμοῦντες ἀπαλλάξαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τῆς ἡσυχίας καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ προαγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ πολεμεῖν καὶ πολυπραγμονεῖν, ἵν' αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ᾖ χρηματίζεσθαι*—prove him, according to Meyer,[2] to have been, not only no Athenian, but no friend to the Athenian cause. He hated Athens, and he judged her statesmen more harshly than those of other states: 'ganz greifbar tritt hervor, dass er für Athen kein Herz hat, vielmehr diesen Staat hasst. Daher beurteilt er es viel gehässiger, als die anderen Staaten u. s. w.' Few, I fancy, will agree with this. The writer is only repeating a commonplace of Greek political literature; the motives which he ascribes are similar to those which Thucydides ascribes to Cleon. The commonplace may be unsound, but it was, at any rate, not more unjust to the Athenian democracy than the similar commonplace which satisfied Ephorus.[3] The sentence in question, so far from being a 'stone of stumbling', is one argument the more in favour of Ephorus. It is exactly such a sentence as he might have penned. And Meyer is forced to admit that in the preceding chapter full justice is done to the policy of the moderate party and its leaders, Anytus and Thrasybulus. What is true of this particular objection holds good of the writer's political sympathies generally. The views expressed, and the attitude assumed, are just what we should

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* ii. 2.

[2] *Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 51, 52.

[3] Diod. XII. 39. 3 Ὁ δὲ Περικλῆς, *εἰδὼς τὸν δῆμον ἐν μὲν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἔργοις θαυμάζοντα τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἄνδρας διὰ τὰς κατεπειγούσας χρείας, κατὰ δὲ τὴν εἰρήνην τοὺς αὐτοὺς συκοφαντοῦντα διὰ τὴν σχολὴν καὶ φθόνον.*

expect in a writer like Ephorus, who is 'ohne Leidenschaft'. Schwartz insists on the impartiality of Ephorus in much the same terms as those in which the Editors insist on the absence of bias in P. The latter's attitude towards Athenian parties is thoroughly Isocratean; the favourable judgement on Thrasybulus and Anytus, which is implied in his description of their policy, recalls the equally favourable judgement on the policy of the 'moderates' at the time of the Thirty which is passed by the author of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία.[1]

There remains one more argument to be considered; an argument for which, I fear, I am myself in some sense responsible. In my article in *Klio*[2] I argued that the chronological errors in Diodorus' narrative of the years 398 to 395, especially his errors in regard to the naval operations, render it difficult to suppose that he was following, at first hand, a writer so precise in his marks of time as P. I am no longer disposed to attach much weight to this objection. So long as Diodorus is content to excerpt, he is capable of preserving the correct order and the correct dates; when, however, he attempts to condense and combine, he is entering on a path beset with perils. His narrative of the year 394 shows him at his best; and here he is merely excerpting. On the whole, he comes out well for the year 395; but even here, in his attempt to combine the origin of the Boeotian War with its subsequent course down to the battle of Haliartus, he is led to omit the autumn campaign of Agesilaus. Experience shows that Diodorus is most likely to fall into chronological confusions where

[1] 34. 3. Anytus is mentioned as one of the leaders of the party in this passage, as well as in P.

[2] *Klio*, viii, p. 362. See also *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. v, p. 137.

he has to find room for Sicilian history. This is precisely what has happened here. Between his last notice of the war in Asia Minor (the truce between Dercylidas and the Persian satraps) and his resumption of the story with the arrival of Agesilaus at Ephesus, he has inserted fifty-seven pages of Sicilian history, which exclusively occupy the Attic years 398/7 and 397/6, with the result that his narrative of the operations in Asia has undergone a serious dislocation. This dislocation is apparent in the naval warfare, both from the mention of Pharax as being still *ναύαρχος* late in 396, and from the fact that the number of ships under Conon's command in 396/5 is the same as it was in 399/8. In order to find room for his Sicilian digression, he was compelled to attempt contraction and compression on so large a scale that, not unnaturally, he failed to find his place, just as, with far less excuse, he failed to find it in 356. It looks as if no note of time, however definite, could keep Diodorus from error. The dates of the outbreak of the Third Messenian War and of the Five Years' Truce must have been correctly given by his chronographical authority ; yet he puts the former four or five, and the latter three or four years too early. To infer the dates from P. requires, after all, rather more intelligence than to look them up in a Dictionary of Dates.

So far as I am aware, no other objections have been advanced which call for notice. Some of the objections have turned out, upon examination, to afford arguments in favour of Ephorus. This is true both of the date and of the political sympathies. Others have been proved to have no weight; e.g. those based on the *προοίμια*. There remain a few which must be admitted to constitute difficulties in the way of the proposed identifica-

tion; they do not, however, seem to me to constitute, either singly or cumulatively, difficulties which are insuperable. When compared, either with the arguments in favour of Ephorus, or with the arguments against Theopompus, they appear, I will not say, insignificant, but, at any rate, slight.

LECTURE V

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE NARRATIVE

Perhaps the most striking feature in the narrative of P. is its entire independence of that which is given by Xenophon in his *Hellenics.* It would doubtless be an exaggeration to assert that nothing is common to the two beyond the period which they cover, but it would be a pardonable exaggeration. It is not merely that there is so much in P. to which there is nothing corresponding in Xenophon (roughly speaking, three-fifths of the whole); what is still more surprising is that, where the events are common to the two narratives, the difference in the two accounts far outweigh the agreements. Hence the question of the credibility of P.'s statements is one that imperatively calls for an answer, and the answer must affect not only the credibility of P.; it must affect, and very closely affect, the credibility of Xenophon, one of our three principal authorities for the Great Age of Greek History. It is a question to which widely divergent answers have been given. Judeich accepts almost everything; Busolt accepts almost nothing. In between these extreme views come those of Meyer and the Editors, which agree, at any rate, in their insistence on the value of the major part of our new information.

That there should be not only divergence but contradiction between the two historians is, in reality, not at all surprising; rather, it is just what we might have expected. The divergencies and contradictions are

perhaps greater, but they are much of the same kind as those which are disclosed by a comparison of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, either with Thucydides' account of the Four Hundred, or with Xenophon's account of the Thirty. It is not the least important result of the literary finds of the last quarter of a century that we are beginning to realize that our certitude in regard to the details of Ancient History is largely an illusion. The great historians have gone uncontradicted, because there was commonly no other authority, of at all the same rank, with which to confront them. But where comparison was possible divergencies and contradictions were at once apparent. It is seldom that a comparison between Herodotus and Thucydides is possible, but there are a few cases where we can set side by side their respective versions of events of which they were, more or less, the contemporaries. Let us take three of them—the unsuccessful attempt to plant an Athenian colony at Ennea Hodoi in 465, the Theban attack on Plataea which precipitated the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, and the arrest of the Spartan envoys to the Persian court in the second year of the War. The reference to the first of these events is a very brief one in Herodotus—less than three lines; the references in Thucydides are slightly fuller—six lines in the one passage, and three lines in the other.[1] Yet there are two contradictions on essential points between the two versions of the story. In Herodotus the scene of the disaster is Datus, and the assailants are the Edonians (ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Ἠδωνῶν ἐν Δάτῳ); in Thucydides the scene is Drabescus, and the assailants are 'all the Thracians', though both Ennea Hodoi and Drabescus are in Edonian territory (προελ-

[1] Herod. IX. 75; Thucyd. I. 100; IV. 102.

θόντες δὲ τῆς Θρᾴκης ἐς μεσόγειαν διεφθάρησαν ἐν Δραβήσκῳ τῇ Ἠδωνικῇ ὑπὸ τῶν Θρᾳκῶν ξυμπάντων). The site of Drabescus is more or less agreed on, but Datus, or Datum, is a puzzle. If Strabo is correct in placing it on the coast, the contradiction involved is a glaring one. It is, however, usual to prefer the authority of Harpocration, Ephorus, and Appian, and to identify it with the later Philippi; and, on the strength of Scylax, to assume that Datus was not founded till 360, and consequently that in the time of Herodotus it was a district, and not a town. Even if all this were granted, it certainly does not follow that it was a district which included Drabescus. There is little evidence to prove that Drabescus was in the territory of the *Δατηνοί* in the time of Herodotus, or of the disaster, or that the district of Datus extended so far to the north. Strabo, if he is to count at all, seems to imply that the *Δατηνοί* extended southward, toward the sea, rather than northward.[1] In the two accounts of the Theban attack on Plataea[2] (a full account in Thucydides, a mere passing reference in Herodotus) there is a discrepancy as to the commanders of the force. In Herodotus its commander is Eurymachus; in Thucydides he is only the intermediary in the plot (πρὸς ὃν ἔπραξαν οἱ προδιδόντες), while the commanders are two instead of one, Pythangelus and Diemporus. Our third instance is connected with one of the most famous passages in Herodotus, the Wrath of Talthybius.[3] In Herodotus the envoys are three in number, in Thucydides they are six; in

[1] Strabo VII. 331, Fragm. 36; Harpocration, Δατός; Appian, *Bell. Civ.* IV. 105; *Scylax*, 68; Isocrates, *de Pace*, 86 (ἐν Δάτῳ δὲ μυρίους ὁπλίτας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν συμμάχων ἀπώλεσαν).

[2] Herod. VII. 233; Thucyd. II. 2.

[3] Herod. VII. 137; Thucyd. II. 67.

Herodotus they are betrayed by Sitalces and Nymphodorus, in Thucydides by Sadocus, at the instigation of the Athenian envoys, while Nymphodorus is not mentioned; lastly, Thucydides makes no mention of Bisanthe (the modern Rodosto), which is given by Herodotus as the scene of their capture. It would be hardly fair to instance the variations between Thucydides' account of the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogiton and the version found in the *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*, for here we are concerned with events which were, in no sense of the term, contemporary. It is more relevant to instance the discrepancies between the two accounts of the Revolution of the Four Hundred. The point is not whether Thucydides is right or wrong; it is that between the two accounts, one the narrative of a contemporary and the other a narrative based upon contemporary documents, there exist divergencies and contradictions which are fundamental. I am disposed to accept, in great part, Meyer's vindication of Thucydides' version; the fact remains, however, that Thucydides cannot be acquitted of an error which is grave, and of the omission of a detail which is essential to the understanding of the movement. He has omitted all reference to the scheme of the 'moderates', the *πολιτεία εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον*; he has given the number of the *ξυγγραφεῖς* as 30, in place of 10, and he has failed to connect them with the *πρόβουλοι* appointed two years before. It is a still harder task to harmonize Xenophon's account of the Thirty with the story as told in the *'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία*, and possibly it is not so easy to rescue his reputation; but here again this is not the point. What concerns us is the presence in the two accounts of inconsistencies which are at once serious and frequent. It is not, of course, necessary to conclude

that either Herodotus or Thucydides, Xenophon or the authority followed by Aristotle, was dishonest, incompetent, or careless. Thucydides, it may be granted, was more competent and more careful than his predecessor; but it will go badly with us if we are to demand a better authority than Herodotus. Thucydides himself knew well enough that it is no easy matter to ascertain the truth; even the evidence of eyewitnesses is not always consistent, for men's memories are weak, and their prejudices are strong: ἐπιπόνως δὲ ηὑρίσκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἑκάστοις οὐ ταὐτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἑκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. And, we may add, the incidents and events which history has to record are infinitely complex. What different accounts two eyewitnesses, equally honest and equally competent, will give of so simple an event as an accident![1] *A fortiori* this holds good of a battle or a campaign, of a political intrigue or the course of a revolution. There is something almost naïve in Busolt's alternatives, his 'Entweder' and 'Oder'[2]; history is, often enough, too subtle for the art of the historian: 'subtilitati *rerum* longe impar.'[3]

In dealing with the question of authorship, we found it necessary to begin by a critical examination of the assumptions which had hitherto barred the way to an impartial consideration of the claims of Ephorus. In dealing with the question of authority, it is equally necessary to begin by disposing of an assumption—the assumption of Xenophon's infallibility. Xenophon was

[1] Let any one try to construct a coherent story of the wreck of the *Titanic* from the evidence of the survivors.

[2] '*Der neue Historiker und Xenophon*,' *Hermes*, xliii (1908), p. 260.

[3] Cf. Bacon, *Novum Organum*, i. 13 'Syllogismus subtilitati naturae longe impar'.

an eyewitness of much of what he records; but, as Thucydides warns us, eyewitnesses are not exempt from error. And Xenophon was competent, in the sense that he was an expert in military affairs. He was competent too in the sense that he possessed the gift of vivid narration. But he is quite capable of omitting details which are essential; quite capable, that is to say, of telling a story which cannot be understood as it stands; he was not endowed with much political insight; and, if he was honest, he was assuredly not free from the bias and prejudices of a partisan. It must be remembered too that the *Hellenics* were published some forty years after the events with which we are here concerned.[1] How far he had taken notes at the time of all the various incidents that he records it is, of course, impossible to determine. It is somewhat surprising to find that Busolt, whose decision is wholly in favour of Xenophon as against P., judged very differently, fifteen years ago, as between the claims of Xenophon and the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία.[2] Xenophon's version may be more correct than Busolt was prepared to allow, but there is good evidence that on some all-important points the account in the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία is to be preferred.[3] But we need only turn to the narrative of the battle of Arginusae, or of the Trial of the Generals, to be convinced that he is prone to omit details that are essential. In the battle, there is clearly some omission in the account of the formation of the Athenian line; he fails to

[1] It is not necessary for my present purpose to extend this statement beyond Books III–VII.

[2] *Hermes*, xxxiii (1898).

[3] e.g. the composition of the Thirty; the existence *from the first* of a moderate party in their midst; the complicity of Theramenes in the proscriptions.

explain how it was that the weak centre, formed in single line, emerged intact and unscathed from the engagement. In the trial, it hardly admits of doubt that the commission given to Theramenes and Thrasybulus, suppressed in the dispatch, was disclosed by the generals in their examination before the *βουλή*; Xenophon omits this fact, and thus contrives to convey a most misleading impression as to the conduct of Theramenes. And that is not the worst; here, at any rate, he is not quite honest; for in the incident of the sham mourners, who are stated to have been suborned by Theramenes, he has said the thing that is not.

It has occurred to no one to claim infallibility for Ephorus. It must be confessed that he comes before us with a tarnished reputation. A writer who could construct such a version of the Eurymedon—who can credit Cimon with *δύο καλλίστας νίκας κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμέραν*, the *ναυμαχία* being off Cyprus and the *πεζομαχία* on the banks of the Eurymedon—is a writer who must be viewed with some suspicion. No doubt, he is a much better authority for times nearer his own day; still, he appears[1] to have combined Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus into one, to have transferred to the campaign of 399 the achievements of Thibron in 391, and to have strangely misconceived the Spartan invasion of Elis just after the end of the Peloponnesian War; and these are errors which affect a period which comes perilously near to the one with which we are concerned. On the other hand, there is much in Ephorus that is extremely valuable. To him we owe, for instance, our knowledge (so far as it is derived from literary sources) of the Second Athenian Confederacy; and, as Schwartz has

[1] The confusion may, however, be due to Diodorus.

pointed out, his account of Dion's expedition shows that he knew how to make good use of good material, when it was at hand. In the period with which we are more immediately concerned, the history of the naval operations and of the activities of Conon, as well as the notices of events in Northern Greece, must be counted to his credit. To judge him by his occasional indiscretions, however grave they may be, would be to judge him most unfairly. The ancient mind was not indeed favourably impressed by his battle-scenes; Polybius brings against them the charge of conventionality, and against their author the charge of ignorance of the art of war. If we are called upon to choose between a battle in Xenophon and a battle in Ephorus, we can hardly hesitate.

And now let us come to P. What impression does the narrative as a whole leave upon our minds? Two things must at once strike us—the abundance of names, and the fullness of geographical detail.

The number of persons who are mentioned by name is remarkable, and all, with the exception of a couple of insignificant personages, are, in some sense or other, attested. Among Athenians there are Thrasybulus, Anytus, Aesimus, Demaenetus, Hagnias, Telesegorus, Epicrates, Cephalus, Simichus, Hieronymus, and Nicophemus, besides Conon. Some of these are sufficiently obscure, but none of them are phantoms. For Aesimus there is both literary and epigraphic evidence. He led the procession from the Piraeus into Athens upon the conclusion of the *διαλύσεις* after the fall of the Thirty;[1] he was sent on an embassy, along with Cephalus, in 386, and again in 377.[2] Demaenetus was *στρατηγός* in

[1] Lysias, *in Agoratum*, § 80 ff.
[2] *C. I. A.* ii. 15 (*a*); 18 (*b*); 19.

Aegina in 387, and later in the same year in the Hellespont;[1] his exploit against Chilon, the harmost of Aegina, is referred to by Aeschines.[2] The embassy of Hagnias to the Great King, and his capture and execution by the Spartans, were recorded by Androtion and Philochorus; if we want further evidence, we have Isaeus.[3] His colleague, Telesegorus, lacks literary confirmation, but he occurs in inscriptions. An embassy of Epicrates to Sardis, in 391, is mentioned by Lysias,[4] and Philochorus (in the new fragment) has something to say about him. Nicophemus[5] is stated by Xenophon to have been harmost of Cythera in 393, and his name occurs in Lysias. Even Simichus and his defeat at Amphipolis are attested by an excellent authority, the scholiast on Aeschines.[6] For Conon and Thrasybulus, Anytus and Cephalus, no witnesses need be called. Of the six Thebans who are mentioned by name, three are well enough known—Ismenias, Leontiades, and Androclides; the other three, Antitheus, Astias, Corrantadas, are all confirmed, in one way or another. Antitheus is obviously a variant of the Amphitheus of Plutarch, and the Amphithemis of Pausanias;[7] Corrantadas may be recognized in Xenophon's Coeratadas;[8] while the name Astias is found in an inscription in its Boeotian form, *Ϝαστιας*. Of all the other names of persons that occur in the fragment, the Spartan *ναύαρχος* Chiricrates and one of

[1] Xen. *Hell.* V. 1. 10; V. 1. 26.

[2] *De Falsa Leg.* 78 *συγκατεναυμάχησε Χίλωνα.* Cf. *Hell. Oxyrh.* ch. iii.

[3] Philoch., Fragm. 153. Cf. *Hell. Oxyrh.* ii. 1; Isaeus, xi. 8.

[4] Lysias, xxvii.

[5] Xen. *Hell.* IV. 8. 8; Lysias, xix. 7.

[6] *De Falsa Leg.* 34 (=Hill's *Sources*, iii. 278).

[7] Plut. *Lysander*, 27; Paus. III. 9. 8.

[8] Xen. *Hell.* I. 3. 15, 21, 22. Κορραντάδας, Κοιρατάδας.

his officers, Pancalus, alone appear to be without confirmation; except, indeed, Dorimachus, the spokesman of the mob at Rhodes. The combined effect of all this, it must be allowed, is impressive.

When we turn from persons to places, the result is not less satisfactory. The writer seems equally at home in Asia Minor and in Greece; and in Greece, equally in Attica, Boeotia, and Phocis. The account of the first campaign of Agesilaus is too fragmentary to enable us to estimate the fullness of its topographical detail, but the narrative of the second campaign is singularly rich in this respect. In Boeotia no less than twenty places are named, and in Phocis a good half-dozen. With the life-like description of the raids and reprisals round Mount Parnassus we may compare the picture of rural Attica before the War.

The discrepancies which I propose to discuss are those which affect the first and the second campaigns of Agesilaus in the year 395, and the outbreak of the Boeotian War.

The discrepancies which exist between the two accounts of the first campaign extend to the route as well as to the engagement. In Xenophon's version Agesilaus marched to the neighbourhood of Sardis by the most direct route; Tissaphernes had sent his infantry into Caria, and his cavalry to the Plain of the Maeander; consequently Agesilaus' march was undisturbed by the enemy for the first three days; it was only on the fourth day that he came into touch with the Persian cavalry. In P., when the account begins to be intelligible, Agesilaus' line of march follows the Plain of the Cayster and the mountains (Diodorus enables us to identify *τὰ ὄρη* with Mount Sipylus): Tissaphernes follows him with a large force, both of

horse and foot (Diodorus gives the numbers as 10,000 cavalry and 50,000 infantry; in P. they have to be conjecturally restored); Agesilaus, in view of the superior forces of the enemy, marches with his troops formed in a hollow square (ἐν πλινθίῳ). The route indicated in Xenophon's version seems to be the direct road from Ephesus to Sardis, over Mount Tmolus, by Hypaepa, which was conventionally reckoned as a three days' march.[1] It was the route followed by the Greeks in the Ionic Revolt, and, in the reverse direction, by Alexander.[2] The route indicated in P. would be a much longer one. Agesilaus must have kept much farther to the west, and have marched, either by Smyrna or by a more direct route by Nymphaeum, to the foot of Mount Sipylus, and then advanced on Sardis up the valley of the Hermus. In the actual engagement the result, in the version in P., is made to depend on the success of an ambush; the Persian force is seized with panic and flees, and Agesilaus sends his cavalry and light-armed troops in pursuit. In Xenophon, on the contrary, there is no ambush; the Persians withstand the attack of the Greek cavalry, and only yield before the onset of the infantry. In P., Tissaphernes is present at the engagement; in Xenophon, he remains in Sardis.[3] Where two versions of the same story appear to present a series of discrepancies (and I have selected only the more salient inconsistencies) it seems as if the task of harmonizing them were hopeless; we must make our choice between the two. Both Meyer and Judeich give their decision in favour of P., chiefly on the ground of the difficulties which they detect in

[1] Xen. *Hell.* III. 2. 11. [2] Arrian, *Anabasis*, I. 17. 10.

[3] Xen. *Hell.* III. 4. 25 Ὅτε δ' αὕτη ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο, Τισσαφέρνης ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἔτυχεν ὤν.

Xenophon's narrative. As to the route, Judeich argues that troops engaged in plundering could not possibly have got from Ephesus to Sardis in three days, seeing that it took Alexander's army, which was much superior in point of training, four days of steady marching; and he is quite within his rights in calling attention to the vagueness of the terms in which Xenophon expresses what he meant to say:[1] *εὐθὺς εἰς τὸν Σαρδιανὸν τόπον ἐνεβάλε· καὶ τρεῖς μὲν ἡμέρας δι' ἐρημίας πολεμίων πορευόμενος πολλὰ τὰ ἐπιτήδεια τῇ σρατιᾷ εἶχε, τῇ δὲ τετάρτῃ ἧκον οἱ τῶν πολεμίων ἱππεῖς.* What is the point from which the three days are reckoned? Is it Ephesus, or is it the arrival in the neighbourhood of Sardis? There is a real ambiguity here; and if this were all that Xenophon told us, it would be natural to treat it as a case of omission—as one of the many instances in which Xenophon has left out a detail which is essential to a correct understanding of the story. But *τὴν συντομωτάτην* is fundamental. Agesilaus' object is to steal a march on his adversary; to reach Sardis before Tissaphernes has had time to recall his troops from Caria. Xenophon's information may have been incorrect, or his memory may have played him false; he cannot have meant that Agesilaus followed the route ascribed to him in P. I find myself unable to accept Judeich's hypothesis as to the stratagem of Agesilaus, which forms the subject of Polyaenus II. 1. 9.[2] He interprets the passage as relating to the moment in Agesilaus' march when he found his advance on Sardis, up the Hermus valley, barred by the army of Tissaphernes.

[1] *Hell.* III. 4. 21.

[2] Ἀγησίλαος ἐπὶ Σάρδεις ἐλαύνων καθῆκε λογοποιούς, ὡς ἐξαπατῶν Τισαφέρνην· στέλλεται μὲν φανερῶς ἐπὶ Λυδίας, τρέπεται δὲ ἀφανῶς ἐπὶ Καρίας. ἠγγέλη ταῦτα Τισαφέρνῃ. ὁ μὲν Πέρσης ὥρμησε Καρίαν φυλάττειν, ὁ δὲ Λάκων κατέδραμε Λυδίαν καὶ λείαν πολλὴν κατέσυρεν.

By the aid of the ruse described by Polyaenus he gets rid of the opposing force, so that he can now continue his advance without molestation. The suggestion is ingenious; it helps to harmonize Xenophon's *δι' ἐρημίας πολεμίων πορευόμενος* with the presence of Tissaphernes and his large army in P.; it has the further advantage of explaining how it is that in P.'s narrative of the engagement the Persian force is stated to have been mainly cavalry: the most that Tissaphernes could attempt, when he found out the trick that had been played off on him, was to hurry up his cavalry from Caria. Unfortunately, the hypothesis requires that the stratagem should find a place in P. somewhere between line 20 and line 60 of column v, and I have not yet discovered where that place can be. In favour of P. it may be argued that the route ascribed to Agesilaus is a less obvious one than that which appears to be meant by Xenophon, and that the advance cannot have been as rapid as Xenophon appears to represent it. It is possible too that Xenophon has confused Agesilaus' intention, or rather his professed intention (*προεῖπεν αὐτοῖς ὡς εὐθὺς ἡγήσοιτο τὴν συντομωτάτην*), with his actual line of march. And if the identification of P. with Ephorus holds good, it might be added that he was likely to have correct information on such a matter as the route of the Spartan king. If that were all, it might be possible to leave the question undecided, or to decide it in favour of P. But unless we are to reject *in toto* Xenophon's account of the battle before Sardis, and of the three days' unmolested march before the battle, what are we to make of the statement that Agesilaus' advance was closely followed by Tissaphernes with a force which included a great body of infantry? Can Xenophon's account of the engagement be simply

thrown overboard? No doubt, there are difficulties in his narrative; things which call for an explanation, but are not explained. That is not peculiar to this passage. But the scene is vividly described, and, on the whole, it is convincing. The *ἐνέδρα* in the other version, occurring as it does over again in the autumn campaign,[1] had already excited the suspicions of the Editors. And if P. is Ephorus, we have here an example of the conventional touch with which Polybius reproaches him.[2]

In regard to the campaign in the autumn of the same year the problem is of a different character. Xenophon affords us hardly any data as to the line of march:[3] *ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν τοῦ Φαρναβάζου Φρυγίαν . . . ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν Παφλαγονίαν . . . αὐτὸς ἐπὶ Δασκυλείου ἀπεπορεύετο . . . ἐνταῦθα μὲν δὴ διεχείμαζε.* That is all; and that is not the sort of material out of which an itinerary can be constructed. Xenophon is interested neither in the route of Agesilaus' army, nor in the incidents of the advance into the heart of Asia Minor and of the return to the coast; his interest is centred on a single episode, the interview with Otys, the Paphlagonian king. In P. the route is described with some detail. The line of advance led Agesilaus through the Plain of Thebe and the Plain of Apia, then through Mysia and over the Mysian Olympus into Phrygia; after unsuccessful attempts to capture Leonton Cephalae and Gordium, he turned in the direction of Paphlagonia,

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xvi. 2.

[2] Meyer thinks it incredible that Tissaphernes should have remained in Sardis during the engagement. On the other hand, his presence at the battle is the more obvious thing, and Xenophon is therefore the less likely to have imagined his absence. On this point Xenophon is not only explicit, but emphatic.

[3] *Hell.* IV. 1. 1; 4. 15, 16.

and finally encamped on the borders of Phrygia and Paphlagonia. On his return to the coast, he marched by Cius in Mysia and Mileton Teichos, and thence down the valley of the Rhyndacus to Lake Dascylitis and Dascylium. The topography is excellent, and there seems no reason for objecting to the line of march ascribed to him. The incidents of the advance and retreat are told in some detail; perhaps the ambush is more in place on the slopes of the Mysian Olympus than in the neighbourhood of Sardis. I see no reason whatever for doubting that we have in these chapters a very valuable supplement to Xenophon's meagre account. In the episode which appeals so strongly to Xenophon's interest, what Xenophon has to say is widely different from the references in P. According to Xenophon, Spithridates had been brought to Ephesus, and introduced to Agesilaus, by Lysander in the course of the previous year, and had accompanied him on his autumn campaign; in P. he meets Agesilaus for the first time on his arrival in Phrygia.[1] In Xenophon, again, the Paphlagonian king, who is called Otys, comes in person to the camp of Agesilaus, and a page or more is devoted to a description of the interview; in P. he appears under the name of Gyes (Γύης), and there is no interview between him and Agesilaus. Spithridates is sent by the latter into Paphlagonia, and wins over the king to the Greek cause; Gyes is induced to send troops and envoys, but he does not present himself in person. Unquestionably Xenophon is right and P. wrong, but the error is not a serious one. The inaccuracies of which P. is guilty are precisely of the kind which we expect to find in a tradition,

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xvi. 4. I think the passage can only be interpreted in this sense.

even when it is a recent tradition. The matters of moment, from the point of view of history, are the presence of Spithridates in Agesilaus' army, his influence with the Paphlagonian king, and the alliance which was concluded between Agesilaus and Otys. Whether Spithridates had accompanied Agesilaus from Ephesus, and whether Otys came to the Greek camp in person, are matters of little more consequence than the correct form of the latter's name, or the existence of the former's daughter. To Xenophon, with his love of detail and his interest in all that concerned his hero, they are all-important. That P. should have been misled on such points affects very slightly his general credibility.

The account which is given in P. of the outbreak of the Boeotian War presents some remarkable contrasts to Xenophon's narrative.[1] In P. it is a party among the Phocians who become the instruments of the policy of the war party at Thebes; in Xenophon it is the Locrians; in P. the Thebans persuade *ἄνδρας τινὰς Φωκέων* to invade the Locrian territory, in Xenophon they persuade the Locrians *χρήματα τελέσαι ἐκ τῆς ἀμφισβητησίμου χώρας*, in order to provoke a Phocian invasion of Locris. These Locrians are in Xenophon the Opuntian, in P. the Hesperian, or Ozolian, Locrians. In both versions there is a Theban invasion of Phocis, as a reprisal for the Phocian invasion of Locris; but here agreement ends. In P. the Phocians, on hearing of the intended Theban invasion, appeal to Sparta, and the Spartans send to remonstrate with the Thebans, and to invite them to submit the dispute to arbitration; this appeal is rejected, and the Theban invasion of Phocis follows the dismissal of the Spartan

[1] Xen. *Hell.* III. 5; *Hell. Oxyrh.* xiii.

envoys. In Xenophon the invasion precedes the appeal to Sparta, and there is no Spartan remonstrance; on the contrary the Spartans are eager to find a pretext for war, and at once dispatch a force to the aid of the Phocians. Some of these discrepancies are clearly of more moment than the others. When the game of political intrigue is being played, different versions of what has happened are likely to obtain currency, even at the time. As Greville[1] once remarked, the secrets of cabinet councils are known only to 'the man in the street'. That the Boeotian War was occasioned by a feud between the Phocians and Locrians, which in its turn was due to the designs of the anti-Laconian party at Thebes, was a fact on which all were agreed. The exact nature of these designs was a secret, and being a secret, it had to be surmised. Nor does the difference between the two versions of the action of Sparta present an insuperable difficulty. We need not fall back on a distinction between the policy of Lysander and that of his opponents. It is more probable that we have here another instance of omission on the part of Xenophon. His statement that the Spartans were eager for a pretext for attacking Thebes (*ἄσμενοι ἔλαβον πρόφασιν στρατεύειν ἐπὶ τοὺς Θηβαίους*) admits of being harmonized with P.'s account that they remonstrated with the Theban government, although they could not credit the charge alleged against them by the Phocians. The Spartans welcomed the pretext, but they were at the same time careful that it should be a good one. Their action in the past proves them more scrupulous in such matters than the average of Greek states. They were resolved to put Thebes completely in the

[1] The author of the well-known *Journals*.

wrong. Their attitude was entirely 'correct'. The *καίπερ λέγειν αὐτοὺς νομίσαντες ἄπιστα* is part of the official note addressed to the Boeotian government; it did not, of course, express the real belief of anybody at Sparta. The Spartans were under no illusions; the Theban answer to the note could be anticipated with certainty; Sparta would get her *casus belli* all the same. Xenophon is correct in both his statements; the Spartans were eager for war, and the *casus belli* (the *πρόφασις*) was found in the Theban invasion of their neighbour's territory. He has omitted one stage in the proceedings —historically considered, not a very important stage— that is all. Xenophon is a partisan, and a strong partisan; but he is sometimes too careless to be consistent in his bias.[1] The discrepancy as to the Locrians is of a different kind; no harmonist, however ingenious, can identify the Opuntian with the Hesperian. This is just one of those cases to which the antithesis of the 'Entweder' and the 'Oder' applies. The one writer or the other, Xenophon or P., has blundered. Meyer and Busolt think that it is P., who has been misled by the analogy of the Sacred War. Their explanation rests upon the assumption that our fragment is to be dated after the outbreak of that war. If I am correct in dating it before 356 the argument falls to the ground,

[1] The Spartan invitation to the Thebans *δίκην λαμβάνειν ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις* is objected to by Meyer on the ground that Boeotia appears throughout the Peloponnesian War, not as a member of the Peloponnesian League, but as completely independent. This is doubtless true; but it constitutes a strong argument (all the stronger, because *ἐν τοῖς συμμάχοις* must be historically untrue) for Ephorus. The touch is characteristic of him. Cf. Diod. XI. 55. 4 *δεῖν ἔφασαν τῶν κοινῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀδικημάτων εἶναι τὴν κρίσιν οὐκ ἰδίᾳ παρὰ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ συνεδρίου τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ὅπερ εἰώθει συνεδρεύειν [ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ] κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον.*

and the parallel of the Sacred War becomes an argument for P. as against Xenophon. It is in favour of P. that his account is fuller than Xenophon's, and that amongst his additional detail is the position of the *ἀμφισβητήσιμος χώρα.* If it is correctly placed *περὶ τὸν Παρνασσόν, cadit quaestio.* It may be added that, if P. is Ephorus, the interest which Ephorus evinces in this particular region renders it unlikely that he should have been mistaken. As Judeich has pointed out, it was not only in the Sacred War that the Ozolian Locrians are the enemies of the Phocians. The feud between the two states seems to have been perennial. Thucydides[1] refers to it as far back as the year 426: *ξυνέπρασσον δὲ μάλιστα αὐτῷ τῶν Λοκρῶν* (i. e. *τῶν 'Οζολῶν*) *'Αμφισσῆς, διὰ τὸ τῶν Φωκέων ἔχθος δεδιότες.* In 421 they are openly at war,[2] and in 418 Diodorus[3] has a decisive victory of the Phocians to report: *καὶ Φωκεῖς γὰρ πρὸς Λοκροὺς διενεχθέντες, παρατάξει ἐκρίθησαν διὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀνδρείαν· ἐνίκησαν γὰρ Φωκεῖς, ἀνελόντες Λοκρῶν πλείους χιλίων.* Nor is it incredible that Ismenias should have found agents in Phocis. Whenever we get a glimpse of the internal affairs of this state, we can trace the existence of two parties—in the Persian War,[4] in the Peloponnesian War,[5] in the Sacred War. Phocis was one of the less important states, but no state in Greece was too small to support an opposition. And if the instruments of Ismenias' policy were merely venal, there is nothing to surprise us in this; Greek history, unhappily, is only too rich in analogies. The account of the Boeotian invasion of the Phocian territory, which is full of detail, is hardly likely to be incorrect. It seems difficult to

[1] Thucyd. III. 101.
[2] Thucyd. V. 32.
[3] Diod. XII. 80. 4.
[4] Herod. IX. 17 and 31.
[5] Thucyd. II. 9; III. 95; IV. 76.

accept the detail here and to reject it for the preliminary intrigues. On the whole then I am disposed to accept the version in P. as substantially correct. It is a version which would, no doubt, appeal more strongly to a writer trained in the school of rhetoric than the simpler tale which we find in Xenophon. More than one story was current, that is clear. Ephorus may have preferred the more complicated tale, because it appealed to his love of the tortuous; it does not follow that the simpler version was the true one.

The naval operations, which are passed over in silence by Xenophon, occupy a large proportion of our fragment.[1] The value of this portion of the narrative has been generally recognized. The touches in the story of the mutiny at Caunus, when taken in combination with the fullness of detail which is elsewhere apparent, renders it difficult to question Meyer's conclusion that the author's information came, at first or second hand, from an eyewitness. I do not propose to deal at any length with this part of the subject. Not that it is altogether free from difficulties; agreement has not yet been arrived at in respect of the chronology, and the list of Spartan *ναύαρχοι* presents a series of problems. Five *ναύαρχοι* in three years is not easy to understand, seeing that the *ναυαρχία* was held for a year; and Pharax, the first on the list, presents special difficulties of his own. We meet with him in Xenophon early in 397;[2] at the beginning of P. his term of office is at an end—he is *ὁ πρότερον ναύαρχος*; and in 396 he appears in Diodorus at Syracuse.[3] Yet in the latter part of the

[1] 200 lines, at least, when the Papyrus was intact.

[2] *Hellenics*, III. 2. 12.

[3] Diodorus XIV. 63. 4; 70. 3. Φαρακίδας is the form of the

same year he is still, according to Diodorus, on the coast of Asia Minor, engaged in blockading Conon at Caunus.[1] This particular difficulty, however, is one which affects the credibility of Diodorus, rather than of P. If the problem is to be solved by the assumption of a blunder, it is Diodorus who must be in fault. But these are points which have been fully discussed already; all that is to be said has probably been said by the Editors, by Meyer, by Judeich, and by W. A. Bauer.[2] And, with one exception, they are points which do not affect the relative credibility of Xenophon and P. The questions involved are questions of interpretation, rather than of criticism. The discussion seems to bring home to us both the default of Xenophon and our debt to Diodorus; it begins to be understood that the naval warfare, which in the *Hellenics* figures as a mere incident, was of more importance in determining the issue than the operations on land. Meyer's chapter on the '*Seekrieg*' is a masterpiece of historical insight. The point which affects the reputation of Xenophon is concerned with his statement that Pisander was appointed to the command of the fleet by Agesilaus before the beginning of the latter's campaign in Phrygia in the autumn of 395. There is no event which he dates more precisely than the appointment of Pisander as *ναύαρχος*: *Πείσανδρον δὲ . . . ναύαρχον κατέστησε . . . καὶ Πείσανδρος μὲν ἀπελθὼν τὰ ναυτικὰ ἔπραττεν· ὁ δὲ Ἀγησίλαος, ὥσπερ ὥρμησεν, ἐπὶ τὴν Φρυγίαν ἐπορεύετο.* Yet, as Meyer argues, it seems

name in these two passages. The identity of Pharacidas with Pharax is generally admitted.

[1] Diodorus XIV. 79. 5.

[2] Meyer, *Theopomps Hellenika*, pp. 65–80; Judeich, *Rhein. Museum*, lxvi (1911), pp. 129–39; Bauer, *Die spartanischen Nauarchen der Jahre* 397/5, *Wiener Studien*, xxxii (1910), pp. 296–314.

impossible to reject the statement of P. that Chiricrates succeeded Pollis in the command in the autumn of 395 (*παρειληφότος ἤδη Χειρικράτους τὰς ναῦς τὰς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων, ὃς ἀφίκετο ναύαρχος διάδοχος τῷ Πόλλιδι*), and that he still held the command when Agesilaus went into winter quarters at Dascylium on the termination of his Phrygian campaign.[1] Unless we are prepared to discard his whole list of *ναύαρχοι*, it is hard to see how we can disregard these two statements. Xenophon is wrong, and the subject of his error is, from Xenophon's own point of view, not at all unimportant.

The life-like touches which are apparent in the mutiny at Caunus can be detected in the episode of Demaenetus. Here too the narrative must go back ultimately to an eyewitness. The same holds good of the digression about the devastation of Attica in the Decelean War,[2] though here the eyewitness was a Theban. The episode betrays the author's interest in Athens; the digression his interest in Thebes. In his view of politics, and in his judgement of political motives, he shows less insight than Xenophon. His view of the attitude of the two parties at Athens, the *γνώριμοι καὶ χαρίεντες*, the party of Thrasybulus and Anytus, and the *δημοτικοί*, the following of Epicrates and Cephalus, is a just one; but in the motives for their hostility to Sparta which he ascribes to the leading statesmen in Thebes, Corinth, and Argos, as well as at Athens, he shows little grasp of the political situation. Xenophon understands it better. It is just such a view, a view which rests upon the surface of things instead

[1] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xiv. 1; xvii. 4.

[2] *Hell. Oxyrh.* xii. 4. The *ἀπὸ τῶν ξύλων καὶ τοῦ κεράμου τοῦ τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀρξάμενοι* is very striking.

of penetrating to their causes, as we should expect from Ephorus.[1] The spirit of rhetoric has little in common with the scientific spirit.

There remains for discussion the Boeotian League. This is a subject of sufficient importance to claim a lecture to itself.

[1] Compare his account of the origin of the Peloponnesian War, Diod. XII. 41. 1.

LECTURE VI

THE BOEOTIAN LEAGUE[1]

THE digression on the constitution of Boeotia is, without doubt, the most valuable portion of the whole fragment. The Editors' judgement, that it is 'the most valuable section of the Papyrus', is confirmed by Meyer, who pronounces it 'das Glanzstück des ganzen Fragments, und ganz unschätzbar'. It disposes of some long debated problems; it disposes also of some misplaced scepticism. It solves the problem of the number of the Boeotarchs. It proves that Poppo was right in his contention that Thucydides[2] meant to reckon the eleven as inclusive of the Theban two, and not as exclusive of them; that is, that he meant that their number was eleven, and not thirteen; and it proves that Wilamowitz[3] and Cauer[4] were wrong in their proposal to alter eleven into seven. It vindicates the insight of Köhler in con-

[1] The chapter in the Papyrus on the constitution of the Boeotian League is discussed very fully by the Editors (pp. 224–31), and by Meyer (pp. 92–102). It forms the subject of a monograph by Glotz ('*Le Conseil Fédéral des Béotiens*,' *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1908, pp. 271–8), and an article by Professor Goligher in the *English Historical Review* (1908). Earlier theories, based on the very imperfect data which then existed, will be found in Freeman's *History of Federal Government*, vol. i, ch. iv, § 2, and in Gilbert's *Griechische Staatsaltertümer*, vol. ii, pp. 47–58. Cf. also Head's *Historia Numorum*, pp. 291–300. There is a map of Boeotia, indicating the boundaries of the μέρη and the position of the πόλεις, at the end of Meyer's *Theopomps Hellenika*.

[2] Thucyd. IV. 91.

[3] *Hermes*, viii (1873), p. 440.

[4] Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, Bd. iii, p. 647.

necting the four *βουλαί* of the Boeotians (*ταῖς τέσσαρσι βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν*) of Thucydides [1] with the four *βουλαί* of the constitution *εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον* of the Four Hundred;[2] while the use of *ἄρχων* as a synonym for Boeotarch disproves Freeman's contention that the *ἄρχων* of the Boeotians, who appears in inscriptions of a later date, was the most ancient official of the League. Its importance does not end here. For the first time we are in possession of tolerably full details regarding a typical oligarchy of the Great Age, an *ὀλιγαρχία ἰσόνομος*; and for the first time we have something more than a few scattered hints as to a Federal League of the classical period. It is to be regretted, however, that the author did not express himself with more precision and with less ambiguity. As is so often the case with our finds, both literary and epigraphic, for each old problem that is solved a new one suggests itself. Of the new problems two are historical ones; the rest relate to the constitutional arrangements of the League.

Of the historical problems, the more important of the two arises out of the statement that Thebes had, in addition to the two Boeotarchs who properly were hers, two additional ones who nominally represented Plataea, Scolus, Erythrae, Scaphae, and certain other places, which had formerly formed part of the Plataean state, but were now subject to Thebes: *τῶν πρότερον μὲν ἐκείνοις* (the Plataeans) *συμπολιτευομένων, τότε δὲ συντελούντων εἰς τὰς Θήβας*. The question at once arises, What is meant by *πρότερον*? When were the two Plataean Boeotarchs transferred to Thebes? To this question three answers are conceivable; it may have been after the surrender of Plataea in 427, or after Coronea in 446, or after the

[1] Thucyd. V. 38. [2] Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ. ch. 30.

secession of Plataea in 519. The Editors incline to the first of these dates. The strongest argument in their favour is the passage in the next chapter of the Papyrus in which it is stated that at the outbreak of the Archidamian War[1] the inhabitants of Scolus, Erythrae, and Scaphae, as well as those of Aulis, Schoenus, Potniae, and some other places, migrated to Thebes for fear of Athenian attack: *συνῳκίσθησαν εἰς αὐτάς*. It seems reasonable to interpret *πρότερον* in the light of this statement. The fact that the Plataean territory became definitely Theban when the town was razed to the ground a year after its surrender (*τὴν δὲ γῆν . . . ἐνέμοντο Θηβαῖοι*) might seem to point in the same direction; it was then that the *Πλαταιίς* became, as a matter of fact, Theban. It may be added that Thebes was in a better position in 427 to make good her claim to a larger representation on the board of Boeotarchs than in 446. Herodotus' statements that Scolus was *ἐν γῇ τῇ Θηβαίων*,[2] and that Erythrae was in Boeotia,[3] do not present insuperable obstacles. The places in question may have been transferred from Thebes to Plataea in

[1] Meyer originally proposed to connect this statement with the passage in Diodorus (XI. 81. 3) respecting the enlargement of the *περίβολος* of Thebes just before the battle of Tanagra (*οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῆς μὲν τῶν Θηβαίων πόλεως μείζονα τὸν περίβολον κατεσκεύασαν*; compare with this *διπλασίας ἐποίησεν τὰς Θήβας* in P.), and to interpret *ὡς ὁ πόλεμος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐνέστη καὶ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις* as a reference to the Spartan expedition into Northern Greece which led to the battle of Tanagra. The contrast between *εὐθέως ὡς ὁ πόλεμος ἐνέστη* and *οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ πολύ γε ὡς τὴν Δεκέλειαν ἐπετείχισαν* proves conclusively that the reference must be to the outbreak of the Archidamian War. This view, which is that of the Editors, is now accepted by Meyer. He admits that P. meant the Archidamian War; he still thinks that the *συνοικισμός* actually took place in 457.

[2] Herod. IX. 15. [3] Herod. IX. 19.

479, and recognized as part of the Πλαταιίς after Coronea. The real difficulty lies in the fact that it is implied by Thucydides[1] that Oenoe was the frontier town before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War: *ἡ γὰρ Οἰνόη οὖσα ἐν μεθορίοις τῆς Ἀττικῆς καὶ Βοιωτίας ἐτετείχιστο, καὶ αὐτῷ φρουρίῳ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐχρῶντο ὁπότε πόλεμος καταλάβοι.* Meyer is therefore certainly right in his contention that Scolus and the rest must have been surrendered by Athens, and been recognized as Theban, after Coronea. It was then, according to his view, that Thebes received the two extra Boeotarchs. The position assigned to Plataea—*δύο δὲ ὑπὲρ Πλαταιέων καὶ Σκώλου καὶ Ἐρυθρῶν καὶ Σκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χωρίων τῶν πρότερον μὲν ἐκείνοις συμπολιτευομένων*—militates to some extent against this view; if Meyer is correct, the Theban claim was based on the possession of Scolus and the other towns, and it was anterior to, and independent of, the possession of Plataea. It may also be objected that this territory *minus* Plataea could hardly justify two additional Boeotarchs. A third view which is tenable does not appear to have found supporters. Thebes may have claimed and obtained the two Plataean Boeotarchs when Plataea seceded in 519. We are ignorant of the constitution of the League at that date; it must have differed in its arrangements from the scheme adopted in 446. But there was continuity of a kind; the League as constituted in 446 must have borne sufficient resemblance to the League at the end of the sixth century to render plausible the assertion that the federal system in the latter half of the fifth century embodied *τὰ κοινὰ τῶν πάντων Βοιωτῶν πάτρια.* There must have been Boeotarchs; a League without

[1] Thucyd. II. 18.

Boeotarchs is hardly conceivable; and the number eleven may well have been traditional. If Plataea had two representatives on the board, these places must have been declared vacant, and Thebes may easily have been in a position to secure them. Plataea by her secession had forfeited her rights; the Πλαταιίς had become *de iure* Θηβαΐς, though nearly a century was to elapse before it was *de facto* incorporated—*εἰ τὴν Πλαταιίδα Θηβαΐδα ποιήσετε.*[1] *πρότερον* would then mean 'before 519'. If this view is correct, it follows that the moral to be drawn from the history of the League is not the moral drawn by Freeman. Starting from the assumption that Thebes had two Boeotarchs only throughout the history of the League, he inferred that the lesson which that history taught was the danger of the material, as opposed to the constitutional, preponderance of a single member of a Confederacy. Thebes became the mistress of the League, 'not because her formal position was at all extravagant or anomalous', but because she stood so far above the other cities in respect of wealth and population. But if Thebes, from 519 onwards, had four Boeotarchs out of eleven, her formal position must have constituted a standing menace to the minor towns. It fully explains how she was enabled to become 'first the President, and then the Tyrant, of the League'.

The minor historical problem is connected with Chaeronea. In Thucydides[2] it appears as dependent on Orchomenos at the time of the battle of Delium—*Χαιρώνειαν ἣ ἐς Ὀρχομενὸν ξυντελεῖ*: in P. it is independent of Orchomenos, and appoints a Boeotarch in rotation with Copae and Acraephnion. The Editors suggest

[1] Thucyd. III. 58. [2] Thucyd. IV. 76.

that the separation of Chaeronea from Orchomenos, some time or other between 424 and 395, was due to a desire on the part of Thebes to weaken her rival; in this view Meyer concurs. I find some difficulty in following this argument. If the loss of Chaeronea had been accompanied by a reduction of the representation allowed to Orchomenos, all would be easy; but that was not the case. Orchomenos still has two Boeotarchs, and it can never have had more. To allow it to retain the same number of representatives, both on the board of Boeotarchs and in the federal *βουλή*, for a diminished territory seems an odd way of weakening its influence. The explanation must be sought elsewhere.

The problems which are connected with the constitutional detail are of greater importance and of higher interest. We know much that we knew nothing of before, and some things that were doubtful are now certain. There remains much, however, that needs elucidation. What were the four *βουλαί*? Were they local, or federal, or both? How did the system work? How is the relation of the one *βουλή* to the other three to be conceived? What was the *census*—the *πλῆθός τι χρημάτων*? What was the relation of the *πόλις* to the *μέρος*? These are the questions that call for an answer. If help is to be looked for anywhere, it is most likely to be obtained from that constitution which appears to have been modelled on the Boeotian, the *πολιτεία εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον* of the Four Hundred.[1]

Were the four *βουλαί* local, or federal, or did the fourfold system apply both to the federal and the local councils? There can be no doubt as to what Thucydides meant; *ταῖς τέσσαρσι βουλαῖς τῶν Βοιωτῶν* cannot possibly, in a writer so careful as Thucydides, be

[1] Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ. ch. 30.

the equivalent of *ταῖς τέσσαρσι βουλαῖς ταῖς παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Βοιωτίαν πόλεων.* Thucydides understood that the four *βουλαί*, whose opposition to the proposed treaty of alliance proved fatal to the policy of the Boeotarchs, were synonymous with the federal council. And there can be no doubt as to the meaning of P. He conceives the four *βουλαί* as purely local bodies: *ἦσαν καθεστηκυῖαι βουλαὶ τότε τέτταρες παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν πόλεων.* He knows of a federal council as well, but four *βουλαί* have no place in its organization. He does not say that the scheme of four *βουλαί* did not apply to the federal council.[1] That is quite true, but it is quite irrelevant. What he does say is that *τὰ μὲν ἴδια διετέλουν οὕτω διοικούμενοι*, where *οὕτω* refers to the four *βουλαί*, *τὸ δὲ τῶν Βοιωτῶν τοῦτον ἦν τὸν τρόπον συντεταγμένον*, where *τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον* refers forward to a description of the federal arrangements, in which the four *βουλαί* play no part.[2] We cannot shirk the issue. Either Thucydides is wrong or P. is wrong; their statements cannot be reconciled. If the issue were simply between the authority of Thucydides and the authority of P., few would hesitate. But the issue is a different one; we are called upon to choose between the authority of an *obiter dictum*, an incidental remark, of Thucydides, and the authority of a detailed account in P. We have no reason to suppose that Thucydides had any special interest in, or any special knowledge of, the Boeotian constitution; we have every reason to suppose that P. had both. The question cannot be decided off-hand by the weight of Thucydides' authority; the weight of authority is altogether on the other side. Thucydides

[1] See Goligher, *English Historical Review*, 1908.

[2] Glotz's arithmetical argument does credit to his ingenuity; but his premisses are uncertain, and his inference precarious.

had heard that the negotiations had broken down owing to the opposition of the four *βουλαί*, with which the last word lay. What more natural than that he should assume that these four *βουλαί, αἵπερ ἅπαν τὸ κῦρος ἔχουσι*, were a federal council? It is objected that the four *βουλαί, αἵπερ ἅπαν τὸ κῦρος ἔχουσι*, whose consent is necessary to the conclusion of a treaty, must be a federal body; that questions of vital importance cannot have been reserved for the decision of local councils; that if they were, it is difficult to see what could be the functions of the federal council; that if each of so large a number of separate bodies, as is implied in four *βουλαί* in each *πόλις*, had to be separately consulted, and had separately to give its assent, on all important matters, the machinery would have been so intolerably cumbrous that the constitution could never have worked. Such objections have little weight. When Thebes sought to reconstitute the federal union after Coronea, the minor Boeotian states would naturally demand some guarantees, and Thebes would as naturally be compelled to make some concessions. In order to overcome the reluctance of the lesser cities to surrender any share of their independence, it was agreed that the consent of each and every *πόλις* in the Federation should be essential in all questions of foreign policy. Meyer brings forward the analogy of the United Provinces; to English minds the analogy that will most readily suggest itself is that of the United States. In America, as in Boeotia, the sentiment of autonomy was strong: the separate States were in no mood to see their rights merged in those of the federal body. Guarantees were demanded, and concessions had to be made; the consent of the legislatures of three-fourths of the States was the condition required for any amendment of the constitution.

Could any procedure be conceived more cumbrous? So cumbrous, that it has proved impossible to amend the constitution except at the point of the sword. Yet the provision was deliberately adopted by a people highly endowed with political intelligence. The cumbrous character of the procedure is an argument for, not against, P.'s statement. When the machinery for ascertaining the will of the deliberative body is cumbrous, it is inevitable that the real power should pass into the hands of the executive. This is what happened in Boeotia. In theory sovereignty was vested in the four *βουλαί*, but in practice their assent had come to be treated as a form. The federal executive took it for granted in 421: *οἱ βοιωτάρχαι οἰόμενοι τὴν βουλὴν* (here synonymous with *τὰς τέσσαρας βουλάς*), *κἂν μὴ εἴπωσιν, οὐκ ἄλλα ψηφιεῖσθαι ἢ ἃ σφίσι προδιαγνόντες παραινοῦσιν*. For the federal *βουλή* there was doubtless plenty of administrative work to transact.[1] On this essential detail of the constitution I am glad to find myself in agreement with the Editors and with Meyer.

The first question has been answered; the four *βουλαί* were local. How did the system work? How are we to conceive the relation of these four bodies to each other? What was the object of a system which at first sight seems so strange?

The analogy of the Athenian constitution (*ἡ εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον*[2]) renders it clear that all the qualified citizens were members of the four *βουλαί*. This is also the natural interpretation of the language of P., though what he says is not quite free from ambiguity: *βουλαὶ τέτταρες . . . ὧν οὐχ ἅπασι τοῖς πολίταις ἐξῆν μετέχειν ἀλλὰ*

[1] No argument is to be based on the plural form—*τὰ συνέδρια τὰ κοινὰ συνεκάθιζεν*. It merely means 'meetings of the council'.

[2] Aristotle, *'Αθ. Πολ.* ch. 30.

τοῖς κεκτημένοις πλῆθός τι χρημάτων. Each of the four *βουλαί* is said to have stood, in its turn, in a probouleutic relation to the other three, to which its proposals had to be submitted: *κατὰ μέρος ἑκάστη προκαθημένη καὶ προβουλεύουσα περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων εἰσέφερεν εἰς τὰς τρεῖς.* What does this precisely mean? In the Athenian constitution, in which the four *βουλαί* must certainly have been borrowed from the Boeotian, the whole body of qualified citizens are to be divided into four *βουλαί*, and each *μέρος*, or *λῆξις*, is to constitute the *βουλή* for the time being, the term of office being a year. It is not provided that it should submit its proposals to the other three *λήξεις*, but there is the analogous provision *ἐπεισκαλεῖν ἕκαστον ἐπείσκλητον*; i.e. that each member of the *βουλή* which is in office for the time being may call in any member of the other three *λήξεις* as an assessor. I conceive therefore that in the Boeotian constitution the *βουλή* which is described as *προκαθημένη καὶ προβουλεύουσα* held office for a year; its resolutions had to be submitted, as *προβουλεύματα*, to the other three; and these *προβουλεύματα* only acquired the form of law when they had been ratified at a plenary meeting of all four *βουλαί*: *ὅτι δ' ἔδοξεν ἐν ἁπάσαις τοῦτο κύριον ἐγίγνετο.*[1] Hence the four *βουλαί* were, from another point of view, a single *βουλή*; this is probably the explanation of the transition in Thucydides from *ταῖς τέσσαρσι βουλαῖς* to *τὴν βουλήν*: *οἰόμενοι τὴν βουλὴν οὐκ ἄλλα ψηφιεῖσθαι.* The problem which this system was designed to solve was not peculiar to the circumstances of Boeotia, or to the conditions of a Greek oligarchy. It had to be solved in democratic Athens, and it confronts us at the present day. It is

[1] *ἐν ἁπάσαις* is the reading of the Papyrus, but *ἐν* is bracketed by the Editors. It appears to me correct. *Ἐν ἁπάσαις* means 'ratified *at* a plenary meeting'.

the problem of reconciling the two principles of efficiency and responsibility; how to harmonize efficiency of administration with the responsibility of all. We solve it in our own way, by our system of committees. The efficiency of administration in an English County Council is secured by the delegation of the duties of the whole Council to a series of committees; they do the real work, and report; but the recommendations of the report are mere recommendations, until they have received the sanction of the whole Council at one of its stated meetings: *ὅτι δοκεῖ ἐν ἁπάσαις τοῦτο κύριον γίγνεται.* At Athens it was solved by the institution of the Clisthenean *βουλή*: the *βουλή* was, in effect, a committee of the *ἐκκλησία*, but it was a committee for all purposes. In Boeotia there was no *ἐκκλησία*; in an oligarchy of this type all qualified citizens are *βουλευταί*, just as in a democracy they are all *ἐκκλησιασταί*. Where the *census* was a low one, the whole number of qualified citizens would form too large a body for efficient administration, and it would be unreasonable to call upon all such citizens to give up their time to the service of the State; it would not be unreasonable to expect that they should take their turn, in Boeotia once in four years, in the work of administration.

This brings us to the next question, that of the *census*. It is peculiarly unfortunate that our author should have omitted to specify the *πλῆθος χρημάτων*. There is no detail of the constitution which it is more important to determine. But if it is not given, it can, I think, be inferred with certainty. The *census* may have been reckoned in money, but it must have been the equivalent of a hoplite *census*. In Boeotia, as at Athens in the days of Draco,[1] *ἀπεδέδοτο ἡ πολιτεία τοῖς*

[1] I should not wish this to be taken as implying a belief in the

ὅπλα παρεχομένοις. This was the *census* under the Four Hundred, in name at least, and after their fall, in reality: τὰ πράγματα παρέδωκαν τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις τοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὅπλων.[1] But the case does not rest upon the Athenian parallel. That the qualification was the *census* of a hoplite may be inferred from what is one of the most distinctive features in the constitution. It is apparent that the organization of the League served two purposes at once, a civil and a military. The μέρος is a unit for civil purposes; it determines the number of Boeotarchs, the number of members of the federal βουλή and of the federal courts of law, and the distribution of financial burdens:

Ἁπλῶς δὲ δηλῶσαι κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἀπέλαυον καὶ τὰς εἰσφορὰς ἐποιοῦντο καὶ δικασ⟨τὰς⟩ ἔπεμπον καὶ μετεῖχον ἁπάντων ὁμοίως καὶ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

It is also a unit for military purposes; it serves to determine the contingents of cavalry and infantry. More than that, the Boeotarchs are at once the civil executive of the League and the commanders of the federal army. Is it likely that in Boeotia, where hoplites and cavalry are alone accounted of, there would be one qualification for military purposes and another for civil, when the unit of organization was one and the same for both purposes? A further consideration may be urged. To Aristotle it seemed evident that οἱ τῶν ὅπλων κύριοι, καὶ

historical existence of the constitution of Draco; at least of such a constitution as figures in Aristotle, Ἀθ. Πολ. ch. 4.

[1] μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ πεντακισχιλίοις was the provision in the constitution; the speech *pro Polystrato*, [Lysias], xx. 13, proves that this was very liberally interpreted after the fall of the Four Hundred: ὑμῶν ψηφισαμένων πεντακισχιλίοις παραδοῦναι τὰ πράγματα, καταλογεὺς ὢν ἐνακισχιλίους κατέλεξεν.

μένειν ἢ μὴ μένειν κύριοι τὴν πολιτείαν.[1] Not many constitutions in Greece lasted so long as the Boeotian: after an existence of nearly sixty years it was destroyed by external force. And in Boeotia it was the hoplites who were *κύριοι τῶν ὅπλων.* If they were excluded from political rights, why should they have acquiesced so long in their exclusion? In Periclean Athens it is different. There it is not the hoplites who are *κύριοι τῶν ὅπλων*; it is the *ναυτικὸς ὄχλος ὁ τὴν δύναμιν περιτιθεὶς τῇ πόλει.* For this very reason the work of the reactionaries in 411 could not have been permanent. It is true that we hear of *στάσις* in Boeotia during this period; there was an opposition there as in every Greek state, except Sparta. And the opposition probably called itself democratic; but the antithesis of 'the few' and 'the many' in Boeotian politics is not primary but secondary. The real antithesis is of another sort; the rival ideals in Boeotia are those of federalism and autonomy.

If this conclusion be admitted, it is clear that our current ideas with regard to the Greek oligarchies will need some modification. It is clear that in Boeotia oligarchy—*ὀλιγαρχία ἰσόνομος*—corresponded to what we are accustomed to call (perhaps I should say, what we were accustomed thirty or forty years ago to call) constitutional government, rather than to anything that we understand by oligarchy. Upon the basis of a hoplite *census*, the number of qualified citizens could hardly have fallen short of 15,000. The hoplites and cavalry together give us over 12,000; and to these we must add those who were over age for military service. The number of adult males in Boeotia, who under a democratic constitution would have been qualified for the

[1] Arist. *Pol.* 1329 A. 10.

franchise in virtue of free birth, cannot well have exceeded 40,000.[1] Thus the number of full citizens under the oligarchical constitution would amount to more than one-third of those who would have had the full citizenship under a democratic constitution. It is much the same sort of proportion as that which results from a comparison of the number of those who had the franchise in Belgium before the revision of the constitution in 1893 with the number of those who are qualified under the present law. Yet I can remember the time when the old unreformed constitution of Belgium was regarded as one of the most liberal in Europe.[2] Oligarchy in the Greek world in the middle of the fifth century had little in common with the *δυναστεῖαι* of an earlier epoch, or with the decarchies for which Lysander was responsible. Constitutional historians have been inclined either to ignore the diffusion and the permanence of oligarchy in Greece, or else to fall back upon such superficial explanations as the influence of Sparta. If oligarchy was so firmly rooted, even in the Great Age of Greek History, it may well have been because it rested, in most cases, upon the will of the people. 'The people' in such a case can only mean the people who count. Grattan's Parliament regarded itself, and was regarded generally,[3] as expressing

[1] Beloch, *Bevölkerung*, p. 163, puts the number at 29,000. His calculation is based, however, upon the numbers at the battle of Delium. Our new evidence shows that the total number, both of those of the hoplite class and of the whole citizen-body, must have been materially higher than Beloch supposed. A proof, if proof were needed, of the uncertainty of such 'statistics'.

[2] The law of 1848 fixed the property qualification for the parliamentary franchise at 20 florins.

[3] A remark of Archbishop Beresford, the Primate at the time of the Disestablishment, serves to illustrate this: 'The Irish

the will of the people of Ireland. The claim was not ill founded; it did represent the will of the people in the sense of the people who counted. In Ireland, at that epoch, the only people who counted were the Protestants; they counted, not in virtue of their numbers, for they were in a minority, but in virtue of their monopoly of the land, the wealth, the intelligence, and the energy of the country. In Greece the people who counted differed in different states; in Boeotia and the greater part of the Peloponnese they were in the main a class of small farmers—*αὐτουργοί*[1]; and it is this class that furnishes the military forces of the state. This was largely true of Athens in the time of Clisthenes; the hoplites were *κύριοι τῶν ὅπλων*, and they consequently needed no constitutional safeguards for their position of privilege. In the age of Pericles the people who counted were of another class, and not in Athens only.

There remains the question, What is the relation of the *μέρος* to the *πόλις*? In the account of the constitution, so far as it affected local interests (*τὰ ἴδια*), the four *βουλαί* are stated to have existed *παρ' ἑκάστῃ τῶν πόλεων.* In the account of the federal system the *μέρος* takes the place of the *πόλις*, though even here the *πόλις* reappears. What are we to understand by a *πόλις*? Could there be more than one *πόλις* in each *μέρος*? Evidently there could be; Lebadea, Coronea, and Haliartus are *πόλεις*, yet they constitute only one *μέρος* between them; and the same holds good of Chaeronea, Copae, and Acraephnium. But how are we to class Hysiae, Thisbe, and Eutresis; or again, Scolus, Erythrae, and Scaphae? The latter, as being *χωρία ἀτείχιστα,* can hardly have ranked

people used to mean the Protestants; now it means the Papists.' Bishop Wilberforce's *Life*, vol. iii, p. 286.

[1] Thucyd. I. 141.

as *πόλεις*; the former must almost certainly have been *πόλεις συντελεῖς*, which was the status of Chaeronea in 424. It follows, therefore, that the four *βουλαί* existed in not more than ten cities. A provision that ten separate bodies should be individually consulted was inconvenient; it is not inconceivable.

OXFORD: HORACE HART M.A.
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY